JAN 18 1930

The New REPUBLIC

Published Weekly

Wednesday January 22, 1930

A New Series by

JOHN DEWEY

Individualism, Old and New

Should We Join the League?

The Wickersham Report

Poems and Reviews by

Frances M. Frost, Padraic Colum, Paul Rosenfeld
A. E. Coppard, R. P. Blackmur, Geoffrey Hellman
Stark Young, R. M. MacIver *and others*

FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY

FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR

VOL. LXI. NO. 790

Entered as Second Class matter October 6, 1917, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

A Momentous **3**-Cornered **DEBATE!!!**

Which offers more to the workers of the world?

COMMUNISM, or SOCIALISM, or CAPITALISM ?

Scott
NEARING says *Communism*
Noted Sociologist and Lecturer

Fenner
BROCKWAY says *Socialism*
Brilliant Labor Member of British Parliament

Prof. Edwin R. A.
SELIGMAN says *Capitalism*
Foremost Economist, Columbia University

Chairmen, SAMUEL UNTERMYER, ROGER N. BALDWIN

SUBJECT—

Resolved: That Capitalism offers more to the workers of the world than Socialism or Communism

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1930—8:30 P. M.
MECCA TEMPLE—133 W. 55th STREET

Reserved Seats $1.00, $1.50, $1.75, $2.00, & $2.75
Reservations advisable now for best seat locations

Obtainable by mail or in person at Civic Club, 18 E. 10th Street; Columbia University Bookstore; Rand School Bookstore, 7 E. 15th Street, and New School Bookshop, 465 W. 23rd St.

Also by mail or in person at offices of
LEAGUE FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION
11 W. 42nd St., Room 1950
CHickering 5789—SPRing 1716

TO OUT-OF-TOWNERS This debate will be published in book form
Reserve your copy now by mailing $1.00

The BOOK of ARTHUR GLEASON

"Gleason was intense, an idealist, a crusader. He was sincere, tolerant, lovable. He fought gallantly, generously, passionately. Mrs. Gleason has done a fine service. She has brought out in this book the priceless qualities which endeared her husband to a large group of friends."—*Arthur Draper in the N. Y. Herald Tribune.*

THE BOOK contains a series of short essays on American life by the man who first set Ramsay MacDonald before American readers with prophetic instinct as to what to be looked for from him . . . a series of essays written in an inimitable, exquisite style . . . also there is a deft appreciation of Arthur Gleason's life by his his wife, Helen Hayes Gleason, and many of his friends, among them Will Irwin, Ramsay MacDonald, Sir Philip Gibbs, etc.

$2.50 *postpaid* *Descriptive circular on request*

WILLIAM MORROW & CO. 386 Fourth Ave., N.Y.

THEATRES

THEATRE GUILD PRODUCTIONS
METEOR
By S. N. BEHRMAN
GUILD Theatre, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evenings 8:50 — Matinees Thurs. and Sat., 2:40

RED RUST
by KIRCHEN & OUSPENSKY
MARTIN BECK THEATRE
45th & 8th Avenue
Eves. 8:50 Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:40

The Actor-Managers Inc. has the honor to present
RUTH DRAPER in her ORIGINAL CHARACTER SKETCHES (including five new ones)
Every evening including Sunday at 8:50
(except Monday & Thurs. nights)
COMEDY Theatre 41st Street, East of Broadway. Matinees Thurs. and Sat. 2:30. VERY GOOD SEATS AT $1.

WILLIAM HARRIS JR. presents
"The first play of the season with teeth in it."
—Robert Littell, *World.*
CRIMINAL CODE
with ARTHUR BYRON by MARTIN FLAVIN
NATIONAL 41st Street, W. of 7th Avenue
Eves. 8:50. Matinees Wed. & Sat. 2:30

LEO BULGAKOV
Theatre Associates Inc., presents
AT THE BOTTOM
By MAXIM GORKY
New version by William L. Laurence.
Phone reservations accepted, Circle 1407
Waldorf THEATRE—50th St., bet. 6th & 7th Aves. Evenings 8:50.
Popular Prices, $2.50 to 75c. Matinees, Thurs & Sat. 2:30

ALAN PORTER
(of London)
on
Individual Psychology: Its Sociological Aspects

In a series of twelve lectures, beginning January 13th:
Mondays, 8:20 to 9:50 P. M. Course, $15.00
THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
465 West 23rd Street New York City

Mr. Porter comes to this country on the invitation of a group of Dr. Alfred Adler's students. Dr. Adler says of him:

"I would not know a better man to spread the views of Individual Psychology in the field of sociology."

Mr. Porter is a distinguished sociologist and literary critic.

(*Advertisement paid for by Dr. Adler's students*)

—Songs by Philip Rockel Frey—

WHAT OF THE NIGHT

DEAR MR. FREY: *I am quite overwhelmed by your musical setting of my little Christmas poem. You seem to have caught admirably the spirit of the poem, and gotten dramatic feeling into the music. I congratulate you.*—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Send for complete list of songs: the poems by Kathleen Millay, Mark Van Doren, Max Eastman, Willa Cather, etc. Each song 50 cents postpaid.

Published by PHILIP ROCKEL FREY, Springfield, Ohio.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1930 NUMBER 790

Contents

The Week 233

Editorials

Should the United States Join the League?..... 235
The Wickersham Report..... 237
The Lesson of the Sugar Lobby..... 238

General Articles

Individualism, Old and New.....John Dewey 239
Forester's Song (verse).....A. E. Coppard 241
The League Survives Its Obsequies.....
.....Parker Thomas Moon 242
The Land of the Free: 1929.....Ralph L. Woods 247
Clear Night (verse).....Frances M. Frost 248
Washington Notes..... T. R. B. 248
Song of Starlings (verse).....Padraic Colum 249
Mostly the Actors.....Stark Young 250
Carl Sandburg and Photography....Paul Rosenfeld 251

Correspondence 253

Reviews of Books

Conrad Aiken.....R. P. Blackmur 255
Marriage and Morals..... R. M. MacIver 256
The New Germany.....Robert C. Binkley 257
Bolitho's Adventures.....Geoffrey T. Hellman 258
The Midas of Barra.....Morton Dauwen Zabel 258
Notes on Novels..... 258

The Week

ON THE eve of the London naval conference, it cannot be said that the difficulties by which it is confronted are any less than they were a month, or three months, ago. The attitude of France remains intransigent; she insists that reduction of her navy can only be made after her security has been assured under terms which it may be difficult for Great Britain and the United States to grant. Moreover, nothing must be done at London which seems to belittle the importance of the League, and so far as France is concerned, any agreement made there must be subject to ratification at Geneva. Italy, also, is insisting on her theoretical right to a navy very much larger than she can possibly afford to build. Japan, while on the whole far more conciliatory than the other powers just named, demands the right to upset the ratios laid down at the Washington conference, apparently with the main object in view of being able to say that she *has* upset them. To some extent, of course, the representatives of all three of these powers bark more loudly outside the door of the conference room than they will when they have entered; their declarations are partly intended for popular consumption at home, and do not necessarily represent an irreducible minimum. No doubt the Washington and London governments are not at all displeased that the conference should open in an atmosphere of general pessimism. If it should fail, the shock will then be less, while if it succeeds, the luster of the achievement will be all the brighter. It must still be said, however, that if MacDonald and Hoover are able to obtain from the forthcoming conference any substantial achievement, they will have accomplished the most extraordinary feat of diplomacy of this generation.

AS WAS expected, the diplomatic conference at The Hague to agree on the final form of the Young Plan and the International Bank has been stormy. The chief disturbance was caused by the refusal of Dr. Schacht, President of the Reichsbank, to have anything to do with the plan as now revised. His plea is that it has been so altered in the favor of the Allies that it places an impossible burden on Germany. Dr. Schacht's action has been explained by the fact that he is a candidate for the presidency of the Reich, and that opposition to the Allies on reparations is, he believes, a popular line to take in Germany. Whatever his motive, he eventually surrendered to the will of the other German delegates. The Reichsbank will, after all, become a stockholder of the International Bank and will have a representative on its board. Authority will be created in German law, to force the bank to do so. Other German banks could, it is true, have filled the place left by the Reichsbank if Dr. Schacht had proved obdurate, just as other and private American banks will participate instead of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. But the International Bank would certainly have been greatly weakened by the absence from its government of any official representation either from the principal international debtor or the principal creditor.

OTHER considerations as well must weaken confidence in the Young Plan as it will emerge from the conference. The original draft provided for a two-year moratorium on the postponable part of

the reparation annuities, in case their payment would create a crisis in German economic affairs. It was silent on what would happen if the danger should still exist at the end of the two-year period. The present conference has decided that no new moratorium can be granted before the accumulated debt of the old one is paid. That decision is bound to create trouble if stubborn economic facts go against the expectation of the Allies. There is a chance that Dr. Schacht is right in his unfavorable judgment on the Young Plan. Even if he is not right, however, his enmity to it is a symbol of German reluctance which bodes ill for a business settlement to take the issue out of international politics. If he adds to his personal opposition the opposition of the German government—as he will if he is elected president and does not alter his position—we may again see the Allies using forcible measures to collect. The decision of the conference on sanctions in case of German default, not announced as this is written, will throw light on this possibility. Altogether, the future of the arrangement is dark enough so that it may not be easy to sell the bonds to provide cash payment covering the non-postponable part of the annuities. Snowden's threat that it may be necessary to fall back on the Dawes Plan may yet be made good, through failure of the Young Plan to function at the beginning.

WE have read so many reports of suffering in China that our minds have become anesthetized against them. The statistics of calamity become unreal; they do not seem to represent living men, women and children, but mere statistics to be printed in a newspaper and then forgotten. Even the most callous of us, however, must pause before such a report as that just made by Grover Clark, a well known American journalist of Peiping (as the Chinese now insist that we shall refer to their former capital.) Mr. Clark has just spent six weeks in a tour of inspection of the famine area in Shensi Province. Two million persons, he reports, have already died there of famine, and two million more are doomed past all hope. Many thousands have frozen to death in the recent record-breaking cold weather. Whole villages have been wiped out, and in others the few survivors are eating grass, sawdust, dried leaves, tree bark and leather. Even if there were sufficient money available, which there is not, the food does not exist in sufficiently large quantities to save the lives of these wretched victims. If it did exist, and were purchased in other parts of China, the famine area would simply be transferred from one district to another. It is useless, as long experience has shown, to seek to introduce among famine sufferers new foods of a type to which they are not accustomed; but if this could be done, and food brought from overseas, there are no means of transportation by which to get it to the afflicted regions. Finally, if it could be brought, it would be seized by bandits and only a small part, or none, would ever reach the women and children on whom famine comes with the most crushing force.

THERE is no one single cause for the famine conditions which have existed in China so long. Drouth was a chief factor, but civil war and the exactions of bandit chiefs have been hardly less important. Agricultural methods are primitive, and even where the fertility of the soil has not been exhausted by failing to use safeguards against erosion, the amount of man-power exerted for each unit of production is appallingly large. Most serious of all, of course, is the desperate overpopulation, on which the only check, other than famine, war and pestilence, is the by no means uncommon practice of murdering infant girls. There is every reason to believe that with the industrialization of China and the introduction of occidental ideas, the birth rate will ultimately be greatly reduced and the pressure of population relieved. Such a development, however, is still generations away, and in the meantime we must be prepared for the recurrence of such pitiable spectacles as we are now witnessing.

AS SENATOR Caraway's committee pursues the investigation of lobbying through sugar tariff and other issues, we are likely to forget that the exposition of lobbying has strayed a long way from its origin. The inquiries were begun because of the shocked public opinion arising from the revelations concerning the activities of Mr. Shearer and the shipbuilding firms in trying to create sentiment for a larger navy. At the time, it was said that the guilty parties would try to create a diversion by turning the spotlight on the lobbying activities of other groups such as the pacifists. Though this specific end was not accomplished, we wonder whether the same purpose has not been achieved by the course of the committee. Lobbying in general is not necessarily iniquitous; in spite of its abuses it is an essential part of our governmental habit. If we try to condemn it wholesale, the armament interests will be protected by the impossibility of abolishing it. But lobbying against international peace is so dangerous in particular that we are well justified in putting a limit to the practice in this respect. This we could do by abolishing, so far as possible, the private manufacture of battleships and munitions of war. Is it not time to return to the main issue in this matter?

PRESIDENT Hoover's letter to ex-President Thompson of Ohio State University seems to us to sound an unduly plaintive note. It reveals one of the chief weaknesses of Mr. Hoover as a political executive. He is oppressed by the number of "hair shirts" provided for his soul by the persons, newspapers and organizations who criticize or oppose his policies, but he trusts that the people really support him as the chief executive of a great nation, rather than sympathizing with the partisan attacks.

There is somewhere under this language a feeling that nobody can fail to approve of him except from unworthy motives. There is an undue sensitivity to hostile comment, however inspired. But Mr. Hoover so far has less reason than most Presidents to regard criticism or opposition as a sacrificial ordeal. There have been relatively little of them. And he would be stronger if he were ready to examine more of the criticism on its merits, make up his mind coolly whether it is intrinsically sound or not, and then proceed serenely to deal with it accordingly. Without legitimate expression of criticism no administration, however wise or well intentioned, could possibly be alive to the requirements of its job. No executive who has to be treated like a spoiled child can long survive the hurly-burly of politics.

WE GRIEVE to learn that Chicago has a counterpart of Boston's notorious Watch and Ward Society. The morals of the midwestern metropolis are safeguarded by the Illinois Vigilance Association, which is financed, through a peculiarly happy arrangement, by receiving one-half of the fines inflicted in court on defendants whom the Association has helped to bring before the bar of justice. The use of the *agent provocateur,* which the New England brethren have erected into such a fine art, is likewise practised in Chicago; a representative of the Illinois Vigilance Society recently visited a bookstore and asked for a book, allegedly obscene, of which the proprietor had never heard. When it was ordered for him, he triumphantly had the seller arrested. This was too much for the stomach of the Chicago jury before which the case came, and it set the book dealer free.

THE Watch and Ward Society itself has not been having plain sailing of late. Following the court trial in the Dunster House Book Shop case, in which the prosecuting attorney attacked its methods and threatened at the next occasion to arrest its agents for conspiracy, it has had a series of resignations from its board of directors. These include Professor Julian L. Coolidge of Harvard, Dr. David D. Scannel, and Bishop Lawrence. It is also understood that Bishop Anderson is about to resign. The society announces that it will employ "disinterested counsel" to examine the methods of its agents and see whether they have habitually acted to encourage the sale of allegedly obscene books which the society is supposed to prevent. The Watch and Ward Society is now ready, it says, to have the archaic Massachusetts law in regard to obscenity altered, though it objects to the specific bill which is now under consideration. It "will not oppose changing the law so as to make the law of Massachusetts conform to similar statutes in other states." In other words, these self-appointed censorious busy bodies are badly frightened by the nationwide storm of disapproval their tactics have brought forth, and are promising to behave a little better. This is good news; but it would be still better to hear that they had decided to wind up their organization once and for all.

Should the United States Join the League?

ON THE occasion of the tenth anniversary of the League of Nations Mr. Parker T. Moon, in an article beginning on page 242 of this issue, presents an able review of its development. In the course of this article he expresses the hope that the United States will in the future become a full participant in the League's activities. This occasion and this hope furnish a challenge to those who adopted in 1919 the attitude expressed by The New Republic against such participation. Was our original position sound? Have circumstances so altered that, if sound then, it must now be revised? Is it likely to need revision in the future?

All through the latter part of the War and the preliminary negotiations of peace, The New Republic supported the proposal of a League of Nations as one of the chief aims of the "war to end war." We had scant sympathy with the isolationists who thought, at the very time when they had been drawn into a world conflict, that the mere defeat of Germany would assure future peace and permit a return to permanent isolation. International organization, we saw, must be the chief basis for security. The attempt to play a lone hand would be doomed to futility; it would not prevent the danger of involvement in any future struggle of importance.

But along with this contention, we had consistently argued that the War would have been fought in vain if the terms of peace were not such as to make true internationalism possible. The settlement must not contain the germ of future irreconcilable conflicts. A just and wise peace was the necessary foundation for a fruitful League. On these two grounds this journal had given general support to Wilson's policy.

With the revelation of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the policy which had been advocated fell into ruins. It is perhaps difficult to remember now the sense of betrayal which came over those who had supported Wilson on the basis of his announced war aims. The influence of the United States was to have brought the Allies to a peace of accommodation, a peace which might last. But this influence—whether the failure of Wilson in France was avoidable or not—had proved inconsiderable in this matter. The peace was clearly punitive. Europe had been carved up in defiance of the principles of self-determination as much as in accord with them. The Allies had grabbed colonies in Africa and Asia. An enormous total of reparations was assessed against Germany. Important nations were excluded from the League—it ap-

peared to be merely a continuation of the Alliance. Furthermore, its machinery of sanctions seemed destined to commit its members to forcible maintenance of the unstable equilibrium which the treaty had created.

Most liberals in the United States were shocked by the treaty. But, with regard to the League, two opinions arose. One was that the treaty, bad as it was, might be modified in the future through the agency of the League, and that the United States had a moral obligation to enter the League in order to further that modification. It was therefore our duty to swallow both. The other body of opinion, with which The New Republic joined, felt that we should expressly repudiate any responsibility for stabilizing the European settlement. Modification of the terms of the treaty would in time be inevitable, it was thought, and we should avoid any likelihood of the use of our power by the Allies to prevent that adjustment. We should coöperate with the constructive and conciliatory agencies of the League, but should repudiate its machinery of sanctions. If we could join with that reservation, well and good, but if we could not, it would be better to stay out entirely. Europe, thrown on its own resources, would probably make more rapid progress toward the necessary revision than it would if we should underwrite the treaty. No longer could we afford to risk the sort of misuse of our power which had already been made by the Allied statesmen in winning, not our kind, but their kind of victory. On May 24, 1919, The New Republic wrote:

> The possibility of any vital League of Nations does not depend, as so many liberals seem to suppose, on the ratification of the treaty. It depends on the rejection of the treaty. The League is not powerful enough to redeem the treaty. But the treaty is vicious enough to incriminate the League. It would convert the League into the instrument of competitive imperialist nationalism whose more disinterested members would labor in vain to mold it into a coöperative society.

The United States rejected the treaty, and did not enter the League even with reservations. What has been the outcome? Europe has indeed made progress toward the essential pacification of the peace. Through a succession of modifications, the reparations issue has approached liquidation. Germany has been accepted as a member. France is on the point of returning the Saar basin to Germany, in advance of the specified plebiscite. Evacuation of the Rhineland is proceeding. The Locarno treaties have been signed. It may be questioned whether these adjustments would have proceeded more rapidly if the United States had been a member of the League. There was a real danger that our presence on the Council would have encouraged a tendency to attempt to maintain the status quo and build up the threat of sanctions. It certainly would have embroiled us in numerous European issues in which it was more wholesome for Europe to seek her own settlement, using us neither as threat nor as scapegoat. Meanwhile we have learned to coöperate with the many constructive activities of the League which do not have to do directly with the liquidation of the War. And we are on the brink of entering the World Court—an instrument of adjudication which does not rely on force to maintain the peace.

It cannot be said that the action of the United States, checked though it has been by a policy far more isolationist at heart than any favored by The New Republic, has been a tragic mistake. It is not revealed by the history of the past ten years as an error which we must make haste to rectify by applying for League membership. And the need for caution is not yet passed. Even the Young Plan does not neutralize the reparations issue as a possible cause of dangerous friction. There are still the Danzig corridor, the Italian domination of a German-speaking Tyrol, the French-inspired "Little Entente," the mandates problem. Most important of all, France still presses for "security" based on League sanctions before she will consent to disarm, while the loophole in the League Covenant for the remedying of injustices under the status quo is disused.

We must also remember that the United States has played a leading part in initiating its own type of peace policy through the Kellogg Pact. This is not necessarily a rival to the League; yet it differs from the League approach in two significant ways. The first is, that it emphasizes the renunciation of war and the seeking of peaceable solutions of disputes, rather than the application of warlike sanctions against any possible aggressor. This is, in our opinion, a wholesome emphasis. The second is, that it is not provided with permanent machinery to investigate and adjust disputes, and to bring about agreement among the signatories as to the identity of a possible aggressor. This is a defect, which makes it in some ways inferior to the League. But the policy of the United States, and of Europe as well, may wisely be to create a bridge between the League and the Kellogg Pact. The League may progress in the direction of the Kellogg Pact ideal by renouncing legal as well as illegal war—by abandoning the already vague project of committing its members in advance to sanctions against an aggressor. The United States may implement the Kellogg Pact by approaching the League method of conference, conciliation, and arbitration of all possible differences. The habit of peace, resting upon the public opinion of the world, is truly the only sound basis of security. But such a habit and such a public opinion must be organized for the application of just settlement to specific controversies.

We may, in time, build a true society of nations which the United States may join without undertaking dubious obligations. The League may be transformed, from its beginning as an alliance of victors against vanquished, into such a society. The

process is already well under way. The action of the United States has in the past decade done something to further that process, and may further it even more in the next ten years. Two cardinal rules of policy are essential to this end. The first is, not to repeat the mistake of the War by pledging our power in advance to enforce ends which we may not approve, trusting innocently that as a full associate of Europe we can modify those ends as we wish. We must not again buy a pig in a poke. The second is, loyally to support all measures leading to the organization of world peace, to seek our own security not in competitive armaments and nationalistic waywardness, but in the construction of a true international society. The New Republic will advocate coming as close to the League as, in the circumstances, this policy may dictate.

The Wickersham Report

THE preliminary report of President Hoover's Commission on Law Enforcement is a very interesting document. As common sense would dictate, it is concerned mainly with prohibition, leaving for later consideration the various other aspects of crime with which Mr. Wickersham and his colleagues were asked to deal. Common sense would also have told us in advance that the report would ignore the cognate questions whether prohibition should and can be enforced. The Commissioners were not asked, they say by inference, to settle these vast problems, but only to decide how enforcement can be made more effective. At the same time there is a vein running through the document which the orthodox Drys certainly will not like. The report by no means assumes that prohibition is an unalterable incubus with which America must be saddled for all time. It says, for instance, of proposals for making enforcement more effective that they are desirable *if on no other grounds than to give the law a fair trial.* Nullification, as a historic American doctrine, is treated with more respect than it has ever received from President Hoover himself. In a striking passage, the report recalls to our minds

> . . . the attitude of the pioneer toward such things. We must bear in mind the Puritan's objection to administration, the Whig tradition of a "right of revolution," the conception of natural rights, classical in our policy, the democratic tradition of individual participation in sovereignty, the attitude of the business world toward local regulation of enterprise, the clash of organized interests and opinions in a diversified community, and the divergences of attitude in different sections of the country and as between different groups in the same locality.
>
> We must not forget the many historical examples of large-scale public disregard of laws in our past. To give proper weight to these things, in connection with the social and economic effects of the prohibition law, is not a matter of a few months.

Within this general framework, the report makes a series of individual recommendations with most of which it is impossible to quarrel. Of these the most important has to do with minor violations which are now the occasion for trials in the federal courts, and have hopelessly overtaxed their existing machinery. The members of the Commission reject the suggestions for more courts or inferior courts and propose instead that these minor cases be heard before a United States Commissioner. This is in accordance with the trend away from the jury trial, which was reported by S. Chesterfield Oppenheim in The New Republic of January 15. If, however, the defendant should feel dissatisfied with the decision in his case, he could appeal and obtain a jury trial. The maximum sentences to be imposed by the Commissioners in these cases would be $500 fine or six months' imprisonment, which would put an end to the ferocious punishment now imposed, especially in the West, on persons whose actual guilt ought to be considered in terms of misdemeanor. It is also recommended that prohibition enforcement be consolidated, simplified, and put into the hands of the Department of Justice. The task of patrolling our 18,000 miles of border would be given to one agency instead of half a dozen, as at present. Legitimate points of entry would be increased in number, and entry at all other places strictly prohibited. Evasion of the padlock laws would be made more difficult.

The preliminary report says little about the present condition throughout the country; it is reasonable to assume that this will be discussed at greater length when the final document is prepared. What it does say, however, either directly or by implication, makes it clear that the picture of enforcement which has been presented in recent years in The New Republic and other periodicals has not been overdrawn. Those rigid and ultimate prohibitionists who are offended whenever anyone hints that everything is not as it should be will now have to tilt their vials of wrath over the heads of Mr. Wickersham and his assistants. We do not doubt that they are quite capable of doing so.

It is of course obvious that the recommendations of the Commission and of President Hoover will meet with bitter opposition in Congress. They involve an expansion in some branches of the government at the expense of some others—a thing which invariably precipitates a fierce political storm. It is also probable that they will require, at least temporarily, a heavy increase in the appropriations for enforcement. They will meet the covert opposition of those who profess to support the law, but in fact are opposed to making it more effective. Despite these objections, The New Republic hopes that the proposed reforms will be approved by Congress. It has long been clear that there were only two possible courses in regard to prohibition: it should either be enforced or abandoned, abandonment consisting either of frank and general nullification or of modification of the law. Enforcement, in our

opinion, is possible, if at all, only at such a terrible price that the country will not pay it; yet it seems impossible to obtain general public consideration of the other alternatives until at least a more serious effort has been made than has yet been witnessed. Mr. Hoover's Commission was set up as a fulfillment of his pledge, endorsed by his party, to do something effective about this vexed question. It has made an investigation in accordance with the scientific method to which, as an engineer, Mr. Hoover is pledged. Its membership is distinguished, and they have labored, we must assume, assiduously. They now tell us some of the things needed to make prohibition a reality. The President should certainly be given the new and better tools for which he asks. If these new tools, like the old ones, prove ineffective, we shall then be entitled to demand, and to insist upon an answer: What next?

The Lesson of the Sugar Lobby

THE investigation of the sugar lobby by the Senate Committee has proceeded along familiar lines. We find propagandists paid large sums either for activities which they did not carry on, or for those which any bright clerk could have performed with equal efficiency. We find the remotest casual relationship with President Hoover on the part of a lobbyist capitalized and sold at a high price to credulous business men, who evidently have an extraordinary misconception of the processes of legislation. We find the customary uproar to the effect that the Senate Committee is "meddling" and "playing politics," a criticism which, even if it may now and then have some foundation in fact, entirely overlooks the important role which Senatorial investigations have played in recent years in bringing to light corruption which would otherwise have remained buried, a role which amply justifies their continuance.

There is, however, one important difference between the sugar investigation and some of those which have preceded it. In most other cases, the lobbying has all been on one side. Manufacturers have done their utmost to get duties raised to the highest possible level, and no one has come forward to say them Nay. There are, however, two sides to the sugar story. The domestic producers want the tariff made just as high as possible; but there are important manufacturing interests—the confectioners, makers of soft drinks, and others—for whom sugar is an important raw material. They cannot pass along to the consumer an increase in cost, as can the grocer. In many cases their goods sell at a fixed, advertised price, and if they were to charge a nickel more, the effect might be ruinous. Therefore, these interests have sought to protect themselves by arguing against the proposed increase which, on a basis of the rate in the Senate bill, would add seventy million dollars a year to the burden, mainly borne by the housewife, which is already more than a quarter of a billion a year. They have shown how small an amount of this increase actually goes to the domestic producers who, in spite of their protection, are still able to provide only a small part of our domestic needs. They have shown, moreover, how pitiably small is the share which trickles down to the American grower of sugar beets, while all agriculture is hurt through the curtailment of the purchasing power in Cuba and other sugar-producing areas outside the boundaries of the continental United States.

Here is, in short, one instance where lobbyists acting for a selfish private interest have told the truth about an outrageous situation and an even more outrageous proposal. They have performed a public service of great value, and we trust it will be reflected when the sugar schedule of the tariff bill assumes its final form. The incident should make us ponder as to the problem of the lobbyist and the public welfare in general. If it had not been for this large industrial interest which happened to coincide with that of the average consumer, there would have been little effective protest against the proposed increase, from any American source. No one knows what reductions in other tariff schedules might be shown to be desirable if they, also, were submitted to vigorous and expert public examination.

The lobbyist is here to stay; as The New Republic has more than once pointed out, he performs some useful functions, and in any case he is too firmly established to be dislodged. The problem is to use him for the social good and not merely for the advancement of selfish private interest. Somehow, a technique must be worked out through which the debate will not be all one-sided. We have the beginnings of this in the organizations which now exist in Washington to represent the general public; but their influence is as yet disproportionately small compared with that of their opponents. There is no more serious question today in the realm of government than extending and stabilizing the sort of activity to which they are dedicated.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN GEORGE SOULE
EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG R. M. LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

Individualism, Old and New[1]

I: *The United States, Incorporated*

IT WAS not a long time ago that it was fashionable for both American and foreign observers of our national scene to sum up the phenomena of our social life under the title of "individualism." Some treated this alleged individualism as our distinctive achievement; some critics held that it was the source of our backwardness, the mark of a relatively uncivilized estate. Today both interpretations seem equally inept and outmoded. Individualism is still carried on our banners and attempts are made to use it as a war-cry, especially when it is desired to defeat governmental regulation of any form of industry previously exempt from legal control. Even in high quarters, rugged individualism is praised as the glory of American life. But such words have little relation to the moving facts of that life.

There is no word which adequately expresses what is taking place. "Socialism" has too specific political and economic associations to be appropriate. "Collectivism" is more neutral, but it, too, is a party-word rather than a descriptive term. Perhaps the constantly increasing role of corporations in our economic life gives a clue to a fitting name. The word may be used in a wider sense than is conveyed by its technical legal meaning. We may then say that the United States has steadily moved from an earlier pioneer individualism to a condition of dominant corporateness. The influence business corporations exercise in determining present industrial and economic activities is both a cause and a symbol of the tendency to combination in all phases of life. Associations tightly or loosely organized more and more define the opportunities, the choices and the actions of individuals.

I have said that the growth of legal corporations in manufacturing, transportation, distribution and finance is symbolic of the development of corporateness in all phases of life. The era of trust-busting is an almost forgotten age. Not only are big mergers the order of the day, but popular sentiment now looks upon them with pride rather than with fear. Size is our current measure of greatness in this as in other matters. It is not necessary to ask whether the opportunity for speculative manipulation for the sake of private gain, or increased public service at a lower cost, is the dominant motive. Personal motives hardly count as productive causes in comparison with impersonal forces. Mass production and mass distribution inevitably follow in the wake of an epoch of steam and electricity. They have created a common market, the parts of which are held together by intercommunication and interdependence; distance is eliminated and the tempo of action enormously accelerated. Aggregated capital and concentrated control are the contemporary responses.

Political control may be needed, but the movement cannot be arrested by legislation. Witness the condition of nearly innocuous desuetude of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Newspapers, manufacturing plants, utilities supplying light, power and local transportation, banks, retail stores, theaters and the movies, have all joined in the movement toward integration. General Motors, the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, United States Steel, the rapid growth of chain-store systems, combinations of radio companies with companies controlling theaters all over the country, are familiar facts. Railway consolidations have been slowed up by politics and internal difficulties, but few persons doubt that they, too, are coming.

The forces at work in this movement are too vast and complex to cease operation at the behest of legislation. Aside from direct evasions of laws, there are many legal methods of carrying the movement forward. Interlocking directorates, interpurchase of stocks by individuals and corporations, grouping into holding companies, investing companies with enough holdings to sway policies, effect the same end as do direct mergers. It was stated at a recent convention of bankers that 80 percent of the capitalization of all the banks of the country is now in the hands of twelve financial concerns. It is evident that virtual control of the other 20 percent, except for negligible institutions having only local importance, automatically ensues.

An economist could multiply instances and give them a more precise form. But I am not an economist, and the facts in any case are too well known to need detailed rehearsal for my purpose, which is only to indicate the bearing of the development of these corporations upon the change of social life from an individual to a corporate affair. Reactions to it are psychological, professional, political; they affect the working ideas, beliefs and conduct of all of us.

The sad decline of the farmer cannot be understood except in the light of the industrialization of the country which is coincident with its "corporization." The government is now going to try to do for the collectivizing of the agriculturalists the sort

[1] This is the first of a series of articles by Dr. Dewey. The second will appear in an early issue.

of thing that business acumen has already done—temporarily against the desire of the government—for manufacturing and transportation. The plight of the uncombined and unintegrated is proof of the extent to which the country is controlled by the corporate idea. Sociologists who concern themselves with rural life are now chiefly occupied with pointing out the reaction of urban districts—that is, of those where industrial organization predominates—upon country districts.

There are other decays which tell the same story. The old-type artisan, trained by individual apprenticeship for skilled individual work, is disappearing. Mass production by men massed together to operate machines with their minute divisions of labor, is putting him out of business. In many cases, a few weeks at a machine give about all the education—or rather training—that is needed. Mass production causes a kind of mass education in which individual capacity and skill are submerged. While the artisan becomes more of a mechanic and less of an artist, those who are still called artists either put themselves, as writers and designers, at the disposal of organized business, or are pushed out to the edge as eccentric bohemians. The artist remains, one may say, as a surviving individual force, but the esteem in which the calling is socially held in this country measures the degree of his force.

Attention has recently been called to a new phenomenon in human culture, the business mind, having its own conversation and language, its own interests, its own intimate groupings in which men of this mind, in their collective capacity, determine the tone of society at large as well as the government of industrial society, and have more political influence than the government itself. I am not concerned here with their political power. The fact significant for present discussion, is that we now have, although without formal or legal status, a mental and moral corporateness for which history affords no parallel. Our indigenous heroes are the Fords and Edisons who typify this mind to the public. Individuals may find amusement in ridiculing Rotarians, Kiwanians and Lions, but the latter can well afford to disregard the ridicule because they are representatives of the dominant corporate mentality.

Nowhere is the decline of the old-fashioned individual and individualism more marked than in leisure life, in amusements and sports. Our colleges only follow the movement of the day when they make athletics an organized business, aroused and conducted under paid directors in the spirit of pure collectivism. The formation of theater chains is at once the cause and the effect of the destruction of the older independent life of leisure carried on in separate homes. The radio, the movies, the motor car, all make for a common and aggregate mental and emotional life. With technical exceptions, in special publications and in some portion of all newspapers, the press is the organ of amusement for a hurried leisure time, and it reflects and carries further the formation of mental collectivism by massed methods. Crime, too, is assuming a new form; it is organized and corporate.

Our apartments and our subways are signs of the invasion and decline of privacy. Private "rights" have almost ceased to have a definable meaning. We live exposed to the greatest flood of mass suggestion that any people has ever experienced. The needs of united action, and the supposed need of integrated opinion and sentiment, are met by organized propaganda and advertising. The publicity agent is perhaps the most significant symbol of our present social life. There are individuals who resist; but for a time at least, sentiment can be manufactured by mass methods for almost any person or any cause.

These things are not said to be deplored, nor even in order to weigh their merits and demerits. They are merely reported as indications of the nature of our social scene, of the extent to which it is formed and directed by corporate and collective factors in a collective direction. Coincident with these changes in mentality and prestige are basic, if hardly acknowledged, changes in the ideas by which life is interpreted. Industry, again, provides the striking symbols.

What has become of the old-fashioned ideal of thrift? Societies for the promoting of savings among the young were much hurt in their feelings when Henry Ford urged a free scale of expenditures instead of a close scale of personal savings. But his recommendation was in line with all the economic tendencies of the day. Speeded-up mass production demands increased buying. It is promoted by advertising on a vast scale, by instalment selling, by agents skilled in breaking down sales resistance. But buying becomes an economic "duty" which is as consonant with the present epoch as thrift was with the period of individualism. For the industrial mechanism depends upon maintaining some kind of an equilibrium between production and consumption. If the equilibrium is disturbed, the whole social structure is affected and prosperity ceases to have a meaning. Replacement and extension of capital are indeed more required than they ever were. But the savings of individuals, as such, are petty and inadequate to the task. New capital is chiefly supplied by the surplus earnings of big corporate organizations, and it becomes meaningless to tell individual buyers that industry can be kept going only by their abstinence from the enjoyments of consumption. The old plea for "sacrifice" loses its force. In effect, the individual is told that by indulging in the enjoyment of free purchasing he performs his economic duty, transferring his surplus income to the corporate store where it can be most effectively used. Virtue departs from mere thrift.

The corresponding change in the ruling concep-

tions of the older economic theory is, of course, the obligation upon employers to pay high wages. Growing consumption through increased expenditure that effects still greater amounts of production cannot be maintained unless consumers have the wherewithal. The consumption demand of the well-to-do is limited; and their number is limited. Purchase of luxuries by this class has, indeed, become a necessity rather than a vice, since it helps to keep moving the wheels of industry and commerce. Luxury may still be condemned as a vice, just as old habits still show themselves in approving thrift as a virtue. But the condemnation is almost an idle beating of the air, because it goes contrary to the movement of industry and trade. In any case, however, there is a definite limit to the consumption of luxuries, as well as of what used to be called necessary commodities, on the part of the wealthy. The demands that make production and distribution "going concerns" must come from the mass of the people, that is, from workers and those in subordinate salaried positions. Hence the "new economy" based on the idea of the identity of high wages with industrial prosperity.

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to measure the full import of this revaluation of those concepts of saving and low wages which were basic in the older doctrine. If it merely expressed a change in abstract economic theory, its significance would not be great. But the change in theory is itself a reflex of a social change, which is hardly less than revolutionary. I do not mean that I think that the "new economy" is firmly established as a fact, or that the endless chain of speeding up mass consumption in order to speed up production is either endless or entirely logical. But certain changes do not go backward. Those who have enjoyed high wages and a higher standard of consumption will not be content to return to a lower level. A new condition has been created with which we shall have to reckon constantly in the future. Depressions and slumps will come, but they can never be treated in the future in the casual and fatalistic way in which they have been accepted in the past. They will appear abnormal instead of normal, and society, including the industrial captains, will have to assume a responsibility from which it and they were previously exempt. The gospel of general prosperity in this life will have to meet tests to which that of salvation in the next world, as a compensation for the miseries of this one, was not subjected.

I have said that the instances cited of the reaction of the growing corporateness of society upon social mind and habit were not given in order to be either deplored or approved. They were set out only to call forth the picture of the decline of an individualistic philosophy of life, and the formation of a collectivistic scheme of interdependence, which finds its way into every cranny of life, personal, intellectual, emotional, affecting leisure as well as work, morals as well as economics. But because the purpose was to indicate the decay of the older conceptions, although they are still those that are most loudly and vocally professed, the illustrations given inevitably emphasize those features of growing standardization and mass uniformity which critics justly deplore. It would be unfair, accordingly, to leave the impression that these traits are the whole of the story of the "corporization" of American life.

The things which are criticized are the outward signs of an inner movement toward integration on a scale never known before. "Socialization" is not wholly a eulogistic term nor a desirable process. It involves danger to some precious values; it involves a threat of danger to some things which we should not readily lose. But in spite of much cant which is talked about "service" and "social responsibility," it marks the beginning of a new era of integration. What its ultimate possibilities are, and to what extent these possibilities will be realized, is for the future to tell. The need of the present is to apprehend the fact that, for better or worse, we are living in a corporate age. Whatever chaos and lawlessness prevail on one side, and mechanical and quantitative uniformity on the other, are, nevertheless, the chaos and the mechanization of a new and unparalleled situation, because they are marks of a society which is extensive externally and complexly and delicately interdependent internally. If the chaos and the mechanism are to generate a mind and soul, an integrated personality, it will have to be an intelligence, a sentiment and an individuality of a new type. Meantime, the lawlessness and irregularity (and I have in mind not so much outward criminality as emotional instability and intellectual confusion) and the uniform standardization are two sides of the same emerging corporate society. Action and reaction are still equal and in opposite directions.

JOHN DEWEY.

Forester's Song

Will you take a sprig of hornbeam?
  Will you try a twig of pine?
Or a beam of dusky cedar
  That the ivy dare not twine?
My larch is slim and winsome,
  There is blossom on the sloe;
Timber tell you, tell you timber,
  How the trees do grow!

There are thorns on yonder mountain.
  An olive on the crag,
And I leave a knotted thicket
  As a chamber for the stag;
Lovely oak and spangled sycamore,
  The quince and mistletoe;
Willow will you, will you willow,
  How the trees do grow!

A. E. COPPARD.

The League Survives Its Obsequies

TO SAY that its friends have expected too much, and its enemies too little, of the League of Nations, would be the approved manner of prefacing an attempt to be judicious about the League's achievements during these past ten years. One might, however, say the opposite. Isolationists, who dreaded the League as a "superstate," imputed to it more strength and more masterful ways than it has yet displayed. On the other hand, many friendly optimists underestimated the actual development of economic and humanitarian activities at Geneva. "Almost nobody dreamed," Mr. David Hunter Miller records, "how busy the League would have to be."

As a matter of fact, the League has surprised many of its friends and most of its enemies. It has made prophecy risky. Dr. Stresemann must have smiled as he presided over the League Council, if he remembered the solemnity with which it had been predicted that the League would be but a league of victors against vanquished. Nor has the League wholly fulfilled the hopes of those who regarded the Covenant as a charter of Utopia. It has not even justified the expectations of Senator Lodge! As for President Harding, who lamented too soon and perhaps too cheerfully the demise of "the failed League of Versailles," the supposed corpse survived not only its obsequies, but its mourner.

What vitiated many early verdicts was a mistaken belief that the League was an utter novelty. Hoped for at Paris in 1919, conceived at Versailles the same summer, legally created on January 10, 1920, and born in the flesh six days later, the infant was no babe in swaddling clothes, but a group of grizzled diplomats, meeting together in the Salle de l'Horloge, exchanging compliments and holding a brief Council session. At its inception, the League consisted of men who brought with them into that historic room generations of militarism, secular national aims, imperialism and ancient boundary feuds. Such a league could be no superstate, when its members were ultra-nationalists. It could not end imperialism. It was no Messiah. It was an organization of experienced men attempting to solve old problems by a new technique.

There was also a new spirit. Sacrifice and disillusionment had combined to revolt the hearts of millions against secret diplomacy, imperialism and war. A watchful Welshman had seen the new spirit of the masses and attempted to be its spokesman, in the amazing address on war aims which he delivered on January 5, 1918; but with greater sincerity and courage Woodrow Wilson had succeeded where Lloyd George failed. Perhaps never in history has a great ideal won such immediate acclaim. Though, for a time, it may have seemed too fragile to endure the violence of the peace-making and the buffets of party battles, in reality it was so strong, so vital, that it has emerged from the ordeal and is now revolutionizing world politics.

It may be that in law the League is based upon the first twenty-six articles of the Versailles Treaty. Historically, however, the League rests also upon this spirit, and upon certain realities of modern transportation, commerce, finance and statecraft, certain long-term trends of history. Their influence upon Geneva is what so many friends and critics of the League were at first slow to perceive.

Two of these trends have contributed greatly to the vitality of the League. Had their nature been better understood, President Harding would never have mistaken Geneva for a mortuary chapel.

To begin with, there is something that may be called "positive internationalism"—that is to say, international coöperation in the positive tasks of peace rather than in the negation of war. This was not the purpose envisaged in some of the early drafts of the Covenant. The bulk of the Covenant is concerned with other matters. Yet no fewer than seven of the eleven principal departments or sections of the Geneva Secretariat fall under this heading: Economic and Financial, Communications and Transit, Health, Intellectual Coöperation and International Bureaus, Social Questions and Opium Traffic, Mandates, Administrative Questions and Minorities. They account for much more than half of the League's activity and a great deal of its success.

Two propositions regarding this positive internationalism are almost self-evident. The first is, that it is the necessary concomitant of modern means of transportation and communication. It is not an artificial creation of Versailles or Geneva. The steamship, the railroad, the telegraph, wireless, the automobile, the airplane, radio, each in turn has necessitated international agreements. Modern communications had begun to create a practical internationalism before the League was born. They would continue to do so if there were no League. That is no slur on the League's utility, but a proof of it.

Steamship, railway, automobile and telegraph have knit so close the world web of commerce, finance and labor as to make international economic legislation a growing necessity. Even before the War there was a world-wide network of commercial treaties and agreements on such matters as traffic across frontiers, publication of customs tariffs, standardization of weights and measures. . . . Since the War the trend has become more obvious and more compelling. That is why the League's Eco-

nomic and Financial Organization and the Organization for Communications and Transit, as well as the International Labor Office, have outgrown initial expectations.

The second proposition is that such coöperation has been greatly facilitated by the organization and technique of the League (and the International Labor Office). Progress before the War was hesitant, inefficient, spotty, because for each new problem it was necessary first to persuade the officials of some national foreign office to take the initiative in calling and arranging for a conference; because conferences too often lacked information and discussed ill-prepared plans; because conferences so often adjourned leaving no permanent organization to press for ratification and fulfillment of signed agreements. The League's permanent staff or Secretariat and the associated expert commissions and committees are not only in a better position to provide systematic initiative for needed measures, but they collect data, supply documents, iron out preliminary difficulties, prepare agenda, and provide impartial secretarial service for the conferences which the League so frequently calls. Moreover, the League supplies the continuing organization, to watch over the ratification and execution of agreements and to work for their improvement and extension. In short, the League represents a significant improvement in the technique of constructive diplomacy.

The results achieved through this Geneva technique are too many and too specialized to bear summary here. One can only give instances and suggestions. The financial rehabilitation of Austria and Hungary was an achievement difficult to imagine before it happened. The health work of the League is widely known and popularly appreciated, but what needs emphasis here is the contrast between the modest pre-War labors of the International Office of Public Health, established in 1907, and the aggressive warfare waged against disease by the Health Organization of the League since 1920, fighting typhus in eastern Europe, distributing telegraphic reports of epidemics in Far Eastern ports, sending out wireless broadcasts during the European influenza epidemic of 1926, granting scholarships for the study of particular diseases, investigating infant mortality, standardizing antidiphtheritic and other serums and organizing exchanges of public health officials.

In greater or less degree, one discovers, Geneva has speeded up necessary international action in the most varied fields. A glance at the latest list of agreements and conventions concluded under the League's auspices affords some idea of the number and range of projects which have already been written into treaties: commercial arbitration, customs formalities, communications and transit, standardization of economic statistics, prevention of counterfeiting, removal of certain import and export restrictions, transit cards for emigrants, traffic in women and children, suppression of obscene publications, abolition of slavery, the munitions traffic, an International Relief Union. . . .

If my two propositions are granted, it is clear that in the field of economic and humanitarian cooperation the League has been reinforced by a vigorous trend of contemporary life, and has in turn strengthened that trend. The combination is happy. To expect not only its continuance, but its progressive expansion does not seem unduly sanguine.

Turn now to another potent factor which has lent strength to the League. The conference method of preventing war, one of the principal ingredients of the Covenant, was by no means new in 1919. It had been employed in Metternich's Concert a century before; it had prevented an Anglo-Russian war in 1878 and afforded an exit from the Morocco crisis of 1905; Sir Edward Grey had used it successfully in the Balkan crisis of 1912-1913. Had there been time to arrange a conference in 1914, it might have prevented the World War.

The Covenant appropriates this device as the League's chief method of preventing war. Arbitration and judicial settlement, to be sure, are prescribed by article 13 for the peaceful settlement of disputes based on treaty rights and international law. But until the scope of international law is much farther extended, most of the dangerous international conflicts are likely to be conflicts of policy on matters which are not yet subject to law. For these political disputes, article 15 provides the conference method; that is to say, any such dispute if "likely to lead to a rupture" must be submitted to the Council of the League.

The Council as a standing conference has notable advantages over most other forms of conference for the settlement of disputes. Above all, it exists. It does not have to be improvised in time of crisis; its composition does not have to be agreed upon by formal diplomatic interchanges. To convene the Algeciras conference on Morocco in 1906 required about six months. By way of contrast, when a telegram from the Bulgarian foreign minister announcing a Greek attack reached Geneva early Friday morning, October 23, 1925, the Secretary General of the League was able to arrange by long distance telephone for a Council meeting on Monday afternoon. Even before the actual meeting, a telegram to Greece arrived in time to prevent an attack, scheduled to begin early Saturday morning, on the Bulgarian town of Petrich.

A second advantage possessed by the Council is information. Lloyd George's Genoa conference discovered its ignorance after it met, and summoned experts to hold subsequent consultations. The League, however, has a permanent Secretariat to supply data and has almost made a fetish of expert investigation as a preliminary to negotiation. To some extent it substitutes facts for diplomatic bluffing.

It might also be argued that the Council is effective because of its extensive powers under articles 10 and 16. Practically, however, article 11 has been more useful. On going over the rather long record of disputes brought before the League, one discovers that the Council has refrained from employing the military sanctions and economic boycotts of articles 10 and 16. It has either persuaded the nations in controversy to accept a solution, or it has managed to keep them arguing, but at peace; or it has refused to interfere. In general, it has relied upon investigation and conciliation rather than upon force.

The record shows, further, that the Council has had six or seven conspicuous successes and a larger number of rather dubious triumphs. I would rank as outstanding victories, the Aaland Islands controversy between Sweden and Finland in 1920-1921, the Jugoslav-Albanian boundary crisis of 1920, the Upper Silesian conflict of 1921, the Memel question in 1923, the Corfu crisis of 1923, the Mosul contest in 1924-1925, and the Greco-Bulgarian border skirmish in 1925. Victories, be it observed, not necessarily for even-handed justice, but for peace. Perhaps Poland was favored in Upper Silesia, Britain in Mosul, Italy in Corfu. Would the old diplomacy have been more just?

Several cases have been settled out of court; several boundary disputes arising out of the peace settlement have been decided by the Conference of Ambassadors with the Council's acquiescence; a number have been referred to impartial commissions; a few have been left unsettled. For instance, after the World Court refused an advisory opinion on the Eastern Carelia dispute, the Council desisted from interference between Russia and Finland. Hungary and Rumania have been allowed to draw out interminably their debate on the property of Hungarian optants.

The disputes in which the League has shown a notable reluctance to intervene have been those concerning colonies, Latin America, Russia and certain features of the Paris peace settlement. Sagacious readers will easily divine the reasons.

This record brings us face to face with some of the realities of world politics militating against the League's success. One is imperialism, still too prevalent and too powerful to be dealt with in drastic style. Having a number of imperial nations as members, the League has naturally been inhibited from interference in Morocco, Nicaragua, Haiti, Egypt. It has even turned a deaf ear to Chinese pleas.

Nevertheless, the League has already had a significant influence upon imperialism, and may exert more in the future. The mandates system, compromise though it was between Wilsonian principle and Allied annexationism, marked an important forward step in principle and practice. The principle is that at least the mandated colonies are to be held as "a sacred trust of civilization," not as possessions for selfish exploitation. The practice is the rendering of annual reports to the Council, and through the Council to the international group of colonial experts forming the Permanent Mandates Commission. It is easy to point out flaws: instances of misgovernment, economic discrimination, exploitation. It is true that the Mandates Commission has no real authority and has been prudent even in its role of critic. To my mind, however, it is most important that four of the world's imperial governments are learning to render account of their stewardship to the public opinion of the world.

Besides imperialism, other forces must be taken into the reckoning. Militarism, for one. The League has so far been disappointingly unsuccessful in carrying out the disarmament pledge (article 8) of the Covenant. The convention drafted by a League conference of 1925 on the international arms traffic has been ratified by seven nations, and a protocol against poison gas and bacteriological war by sixteen. A draft convention on the private manufacture of arms has been considered. Statistics have been published, and committees have held innumerable meetings. Yet the general disarmament conference so long planned and so often deferred is still to be held.

Indirectly, however, the League's disarmament discussions have had several results which may prove to be of inestimable value. They have undoubtedly helped to strengthen public interest in the problem. They have revealed, for Europe at least, the vital connection between disarmament, security and arbitration. If the abortive Geneva Protocol of 1924 was one result, the successful Locarno Pact of 1925 was another.

The realization that drastic reduction of armament is unlikely until nations feel more secure, and that security requires improvement of the peaceful machinery for preventing war, has stimulated a variety of valuable projects. It inspired a series of extremely interesting studies which took shape in the Ninth Assembly's plan for a model treaty and the Tenth Assembly's proposal for a general convention to tighten up the League's methods of preventing war. It was one of the reasons for the Tenth Assembly's decision to build a radio-telegraphic station to speed up League communications in time of crisis; and for a like purpose it has been proposed that airplanes on League business be assured free passage.

The same train of thought lies back of the model treaties on arbitration and conciliation recommended by the Ninth Assembly. It has led indirectly to the draft convention for financial assistance to states victims of aggression.

Many of these matters are still projects untried by experience, though formulated in the light of experience. If, however, the minds of statesmen and peoples continue to work along these lines, the grip of militarism upon the world will assuredly be

weakened. Nothing can be more fatal to excessive armaments than a sane realization that security depends primarily upon perfecting the means of settling disputes without war.

To imperialism and militarism we may add nationalism as a third member of an unholy trinity. Reckless nationalism left post-War Europe scarred with new boundary disputes, new Alsace-Lorraines, new minority problems. These remain, some of them inevitable; some, mockeries of justice; some, perils to peace.

The League has been able to make a few readjustments, as in Upper Silesia, Bürgenland, Memel and Jaworzina; and it has afforded some protection to minorities in eastern and central Europe—just how much, the privacy of the procedure and the very nature of the problem make it difficult to estimate. But the League has not freed Austrian South Tyrol from Italy, or returned the Saar Basin to Germany (although France now seems disposed to make the return), or restored Danzig to Germany, or attempted to remedy various obvious injustices in the boundaries of the succession states. Critics who have denounced the League for sanctifying the iniquities of Versailles, Saint-Germain, Neuilly and the Trianon, have been thinking in idealistic but not eminently practical terms. There is one sufficient reason why the League could not, in this past decade, undertake radical revision of the boundaries so recently drawn. Even the atmosphere of Geneva could hardly be expected to induce such immediate exhilaration on the part of French, Italian, Polish, Czech and Rumanian statesmen that they would easily surrender the spoils of victory.

Article 19 of the Covenant, stipulating that the Assembly of the League may "advise the reconsideration" of treaties which have become "inapplicable" and the "consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world," has remained a dead letter from 1920, when Peru and Bolivia attempted to invoke it, to 1929, when China redirected attention to its importance. Its value as a safety valve may yet be demonstrated.

During a decade the largest European nation has remained outside the League. Russian leaders have been frankly hostile or contemptuous toward Geneva. Russian participation in the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament served only to reveal more clearly the gulf between eastern and western Europe. Communist fears that the League would act as a capitalist coalition against Russia have so far proved empty. In reality, the League has handled Russia with gloves. On the other hand, the fears of a Bolshevist attack on western Europe, or of a Russo-German attack, have been somewhat calmed by almost ten years of peace. Still there persists an uncertainty about Russia which will doubtless serve, paradoxically, to impede European disarmament and simultaneously to strengthen the resolve of bourgeois governments in western and central Europe to remain peaceably united in the League, lest by disunion they expose themselves to attack.

With the one other isolated Great Power, the League's relations have vastly improved during this eventful decade. Each year more Americans seem to be making the discovery that what Woodrow Wilson fought for at Paris and died for in Washington was, and is, a world-wide attempt to realize America's noblest ideals. Many a name will be forgotten by history before that of the President of the United States who earned the grateful recognition of mankind as "Founder of the League of Nations."

At this distance of years, we can recall with more amusement than shame the droll extravagances to which isolationism led the Harding Administration: the failure of the State Department to acknowledge League communications during the first half-year; the transmission of opium-traffic information to the League through the Dutch government; the fear of conferences even on innocent economic topics; the temporary amnesia regarding the courageously helpful part which the United States had formerly played in international conferences.

Then came the era of "unofficial observers." The State Department realized the necessity of contact with the humanitarian and economic work of the League, but still felt constrained to maintain at least a fiction of isolation, perhaps for the benefit of certain senators.

Presently the fiction was discarded as regards conferences on customs formalities, disarmament, import and export restrictions, opium and various other matters. Secretary Kellogg at length announced our willingness to "coöperate freely, fully and helpfully with the League in matters of genuine international concern," and Mr. Hoover has reaffirmed the policy. These promises have not yet been wholly fulfilled, but the record of the past seven years affords good reason to anticipate that straightforward official coöperation will increasingly be substituted for side-window observation and back-stairs diplomacy. America cannot afford to be voiceless in international economic legislation; still less can we afford to be "not present" in humanitarian and scientific meetings.

The Root Formula of 1929 and the Paris Pact open up important avenues of *rapprochement*. The former holds out a bright prospect of enabling us to join the Permanent Court of International Justice. Is it too much to hope that in some future year we may also join the nations, now forty in number, which have signed the "optional clause" giving the Court compulsory jurisdiction over their justiciable disputes?

The Paris Pact for the Renunciation of War opens up broader problems concerning our atti-

tude toward war-prevention. Literally interpreted, the second article of the Pact goes farther than the Covenant in renouncing not only unjust wars, as the Covenant does, but even wars for the enforcement of arbitral decisions or other justified claims. It renounces, too, the right of duel in matters on which world opinion is divided. Hence, the resolution passed by the Tenth Assembly on September 24, 1929, providing for a committee to draft amendments harmonizing articles 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant with the terms of the Pact.

If the League has indicated a willingness to cooperate with the United States regarding the Pact, what of our attitude? It has been well argued that morally the United States can hardly sell arms or provide raw materials and food to a nation which violates the Pact (and the Covenant)—in other words, that the United States cannot be strictly neutral in case the Pact should be broken. Some official indication of our policy toward Pact-breakers would doubtless afford tremendous relief at Geneva, strengthen the League's war-prevention plans, discourage war-breeders and simplify the problems of naval disarmament and freedom of the seas. The chief obstacles seem to be a reluctance to adopt rigid pledges, a doubt as to the possibility of defining aggression, and a desire that we should decide our own course in any crisis, instead of following the League's lead.

These obstacles may grow less formidable in the next decade. A careful perusal of the League's published committee reports on the subject, together with a study of the League's record, ought to convince any open-minded reader that the League system is not by any means so rigid as one might suppose, and that there is little likelihood of the Council's attempting to apply boycotts or other sanctions against an aggressor unless the case is so clear as to leave small room for doubt as to either the justice or the expediency of the action. In such a case, would the State Department at Washington be likely to believe that the "aggressor" was innocent, the victim guilty?

It does not require a very bold flight of imagination to conceive that the establishment of trans-Atlantic telephone service and of a League wireless station may make it possible for Washington and Geneva to hold long-range, but timely consultations before either takes a definite stand in a war crisis. If on consultation they should find themselves happily in agreement, coöperation might be desired as much on this side of the Atlantic as in Geneva.

However such coöperation may be effected, it will do more than a dozen cruisers to increase the security of the United States, as well as that of other nations. The League machinery may not be effective in case the Great Powers should be aligned in coalitions determined on war. But it has proved itself to be the most effective mechanism yet devised to promote the settlement of disputes before they reach the stage of arousing an irresistible war spirit. It has settled disputes involving Great Powers, as well as disputes among small powers. To set up a rival mechanism world-wide in operation would be fantastic. To attempt the application of the Pact without any mechanism produces such a spectacle of straggling, retarded, irritating exhortations as we have recently witnessed in the Manchurian crisis.

The problem of coöperation would, of course, be much simpler if the United States were a voting member of the League of Nations. I do not venture to predict how soon it will happen, but I am convinced that the United States will eventually find membership and leadership preferable to cooperation. The prodigal parent will return.

Looking back over the past decade, the League may justly congratulate itself upon the obstacles over which it has triumphed. Hope was at times feeble in those early years, when the League was overshadowed by Allied continuation conferences, when President Harding seemed bent on substituting some other plan for the League, when war raged in eastern Europe and in Anatolia, when French troops were in the Ruhr, when Mussolini's troops were in Corfu, when Germany was still a resentful non-member, and Latin-American nations seemed to be drifting away.

A different League enters the second decade, with fifty-four members, with seven premiers and twenty-one foreign ministers among the fifty-three delegations at the last Assembly, with Latin-American nations showing more enthusiasm, with the Allies evacuating the Rhineland and seeking final settlement of the reparations problem, with the cornerstone laid for permanent buildings, with increasing coöperation from America, with talk of a tariff truce in Europe and discussions of a United States of Europe, with the Kellogg Pact in force, with a growing support in the public opinion of the world.

The problems ahead should not be minimized—boundary disputes not only in Europe, but in other continents, conflicts between imperialism and self-determination, armament rivalry, economic struggles, the coming of a new generation which may forget the sordidness and exaggerate the romance of war. . . .

Looking these problems honestly in the face, it is possible to be more hopeful now than at any time in the past decade. If the League can succeed during one more decade in preventing small disputes from growing into great wars, the Geneva technique of practical coöperation may open up such vistas of progress for mankind that the next contributor of a decennial article on the League will be able to write: "Intelligence and Idealism have added to their list of triumphs a final victory over war."

PARKER THOMAS MOON.

The Land of the Free: 1929

January

AT THE instigation of John S. Sumner, head of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, New York police raid retail book stores, seize 800 copies of "The Well of Loneliness" by Miss Radclyffe Hall, and serve summonses on the publishers.

Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett indicted under the obscenity statute by a federal grand jury for publicly circulating her pamphlet, "The Sex Side of Life: An Explanation for Young People," a document originally published in the Medical Review of Reviews in 1918.

"Known criminals and divekeepers have no constitutional rights," declares Grover A. Whalen, New York Police Commissioner, in a public statement.

February

A private policeman visits the home of John Barkoski, a miner of Santiago, Pa., gets drunk and beats him with the butt of his gun when told to behave. Barkoski brought to the barracks of the private police of the Pittsburgh Coal Company, where Lieutenant W. J. Lyster beats him with a poker and jumps on him, resulting in his death the next morning. Lyster acquitted of the murder.

The Richmond, Va., Board of Aldermen pass an ordinance segregating residences of white and colored people, in spite of unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in a Louisville, Ky., case, declaring such ordinances unconstitutional.

Maximum penalty for violation of the Volstead Act increased to five years in prison or a fine of $10,000, or both, the penalty hitherto reserved for such crimes as arson, rape, burglary and second-degree murder.

March

A member of the faculty of the University of Missouri dismissed and others disciplined for circulating a sex questionnaire among men and women students.

April

A gang of Elizabethton, Tenn., business men kidnaps Alfred L. Hoffman and Edward M. McGrady of the American Federation of Labor, and sends them out of the state at the point of a gun for organizing mill workers.

In South Carolina a twelve-year-old Negro girl, unable to pay a fine for carrying a bottle of whisky across the street, is sent to jail for thirty days.

New York police raid the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau in New York City, arrest two doctors and three nurses and seize various documents, among them medical records.

Gang of masked men raids headquarters of National Textile Workers' Union in Gastonia, N. C., and demolishes office and relief stores with sledge-hammers.

When union leaders demanded right to parade through streets of city on April 20, the city council of Gastonia, N. C., hastily meets the night before and passes a law making parades without a permit illegal. The union then refused a permit.

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes of Smith College not allowed to speak about the imprisonment of Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings before members of the Students' Liberal Club of the University of Pittsburgh on the campus, by orders of the Dean and Chancellor of the college.

May

The House of Representatives greets with applause the news that a young man was shot and killed by a policeman's bullet as he was driving a truck which was later discovered to be transporting liquor.

Gastonia, N. C., police disperse picket lines as "parades" and arrest strikers without cause.

In California, a man is sent to jail at Redwood City, San Mateo County, for three months, for selling a copy of Mrs. Margaret Sanger's pamphlet, "Family Limitation."

June

Rosika Schwimmer denied American citizenship because of her refusal to bear arms.

Dr. Douglas MacIntosh denied American citizenship because of unsatisfactory reply to the question, "If necessary, are you willing to take up arms in the defense of this country?"

Six-year-old child in Paintsville, Ky., found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to fifteen years in the reformatory for shooting his playmate with his father's gun.

July

Meeting of the Workers' International Relief called to discuss Gastonia, N. C., trial and to raise funds for strikers' cause, is raided by Philadelphia police. Fifty persons taken to jail in patrol wagons, lodged in cells for the night, and discharged in the morning.

The Roosevelt High School of Los Angeles, a public institution, refuses a diploma of graduation to Max Rosenstein because he is a member of the Young Workers' League, a communist organization.

August

More than thirty-five halls and theaters in Boston refuse or ignore applications of peaceful and law-abiding committee to hold Sacco-Vanzetti memorial meeting.

September

Alfred Baker Lewis and Jackson Wales, speaking on the Boston Common about Sacco and Vanzetti, are forced by the police to relinquish their permit to speak and then arrested for speaking without a permit.

Gastonia, N. C., mob raids office of the International Labor Defense, destroys much property, kidnaps, beats and then releases three union leaders.

Mob of mill officials and employees fires into unarmed group of workers on their way to a union meeting and kills Ella May Wiggins, twenty-nine-year-old mill worker and mother of five children.

tude toward war-prevention. Literally interpreted, the second article of the Pact goes farther than the Covenant in renouncing not only unjust wars, as the Covenant does, but even wars for the enforcement of arbitral decisions or other justified claims. It renounces, too, the right of duel in matters on which world opinion is divided. Hence, the resolution passed by the Tenth Assembly on September 24, 1929, providing for a committee to draft amendments harmonizing articles 12, 13 and 15 of the Covenant with the terms of the Pact.

If the League has indicated a willingness to cooperate with the United States regarding the Pact, what of our attitude? It has been well argued that morally the United States can hardly sell arms or provide raw materials and food to a nation which violates the Pact (and the Covenant)—in other words, that the United States cannot be strictly neutral in case the Pact should be broken. Some official indication of our policy toward Pact-breakers would doubtless afford tremendous relief at Geneva, strengthen the League's war-prevention plans, discourage war-breeders and simplify the problems of naval disarmament and freedom of the seas. The chief obstacles seem to be a reluctance to adopt rigid pledges, a doubt as to the possibility of defining aggression, and a desire that we should decide our own course in any crisis, instead of following the League's lead.

These obstacles may grow less formidable in the next decade. A careful perusal of the League's published committee reports on the subject, together with a study of the League's record, ought to convince any open-minded reader that the League system is not by any means so rigid as one might suppose, and that there is little likelihood of the Council's attempting to apply boycotts or other sanctions against an aggressor unless the case is so clear as to leave small room for doubt as to either the justice or the expediency of the action. In such a case, would the State Department at Washington be likely to believe that the "aggressor" was innocent, the victim guilty?

It does not require a very bold flight of imagination to conceive that the establishment of trans-Atlantic telephone service and of a League wireless station may make it possible for Washington and Geneva to hold long-range, but timely consultations before either takes a definite stand in a war crisis. If on consultation they should find themselves happily in agreement, coöperation might be desired as much on this side of the Atlantic as in Geneva.

However such coöperation may be effected, it will do more than a dozen cruisers to increase the security of the United States, as well as that of other nations. The League machinery may not be effective in case the Great Powers should be aligned in coalitions determined on war. But it has proved itself to be the most effective mechanism yet devised to promote the settlement of disputes before they reach the stage of arousing an irresistible war spirit. It has settled disputes involving Great Powers, as well as disputes among small powers. To set up a rival mechanism world-wide in operation would be fantastic. To attempt the application of the Pact without any mechanism produces such a spectacle of straggling, retarded, irritating exhortations as we have recently witnessed in the Manchurian crisis.

The problem of coöperation would, of course, be much simpler if the United States were a voting member of the League of Nations. I do not venture to predict how soon it will happen, but I am convinced that the United States will eventually find membership and leadership preferable to cooperation. The prodigal parent will return.

Looking back over the past decade, the League may justly congratulate itself upon the obstacles over which it has triumphed. Hope was at times feeble in those early years, when the League was overshadowed by Allied continuation conferences, when President Harding seemed bent on substituting some other plan for the League, when war raged in eastern Europe and in Anatolia, when French troops were in the Ruhr, when Mussolini's troops were in Corfu, when Germany was still a resentful non-member, and Latin-American nations seemed to be drifting away.

A different League enters the second decade, with fifty-four members, with seven premiers and twenty-one foreign ministers among the fifty-three delegations at the last Assembly, with Latin-American nations showing more enthusiasm, with the Allies evacuating the Rhineland and seeking final settlement of the reparations problem, with the cornerstone laid for permanent buildings, with increasing coöperation from America, with talk of a tariff truce in Europe and discussions of a United States of Europe, with the Kellogg Pact in force, with a growing support in the public opinion of the world.

The problems ahead should not be minimized—boundary disputes not only in Europe, but in other continents, conflicts between imperialism and self-determination, armament rivalry, economic struggles, the coming of a new generation which may forget the sordidness and exaggerate the romance of war. . . .

Looking these problems honestly in the face, it is possible to be more hopeful now than at any time in the past decade. If the League can succeed during one more decade in preventing small disputes from growing into great wars, the Geneva technique of practical coöperation may open up such vistas of progress for mankind that the next contributor of a decennial article on the League will be able to write: "Intelligence and Idealism have added to their list of triumphs a final victory over war."

PARKER THOMAS MOON.

The Land of the Free: 1929

January

AT THE instigation of John S. Sumner, head of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, New York police raid retail book stores, seize 800 copies of "The Well of Loneliness" by Miss Radclyffe Hall, and serve summonses on the publishers.

Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett indicted under the obscenity statute by a federal grand jury for publicly circulating her pamphlet, "The Sex Side of Life: An Explanation for Young People," a document originally published in the Medical Review of Reviews in 1918.

"Known criminals and divekeepers have no constitutional rights," declares Grover A. Whalen, New York Police Commissioner, in a public statement.

February

A private policeman visits the home of John Barkoski, a miner of Santiago, Pa., gets drunk and beats him with the butt of his gun when told to behave. Barkoski brought to the barracks of the private police of the Pittsburgh Coal Company, where Lieutenant W. J. Lyster beats him with a poker and jumps on him, resulting in his death the next morning. Lyster acquitted of the murder.

The Richmond, Va., Board of Aldermen pass an ordinance segregating residences of white and colored people, in spite of unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in a Louisville, Ky., case, declaring such ordinances unconstitutional.

Maximum penalty for violation of the Volstead Act increased to five years in prison or a fine of $10,000, or both, the penalty hitherto reserved for such crimes as arson, rape, burglary and second-degree murder.

March

A member of the faculty of the University of Missouri dismissed and others disciplined for circulating a sex questionnaire among men and women students.

April

A gang of Elizabethton, Tenn., business men kidnaps Alfred L. Hoffman and Edward M. McGrady of the American Federation of Labor, and sends them out of the state at the point of a gun for organizing mill workers.

In South Carolina a twelve-year-old Negro girl, unable to pay a fine for carrying a bottle of whisky across the street, is sent to jail for thirty days.

New York police raid the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau in New York City, arrest two doctors and three nurses and seize various documents, among them medical records.

Gang of masked men raids headquarters of National Textile Workers' Union in Gastonia, N. C., and demolishes office and relief stores with sledge-hammers.

When union leaders demanded right to parade through streets of city on April 20, the city council of Gastonia, N. C., hastily meets the night before and passes a law making parades without a permit illegal. The union then refused a permit.

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes of Smith College not allowed to speak about the imprisonment of Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings before members of the Students' Liberal Club of the University of Pittsburgh on the campus, by orders of the Dean and Chancellor of the college.

May

The House of Representatives greets with applause the news that a young man was shot and killed by a policeman's bullet as he was driving a truck which was later discovered to be transporting liquor.

Gastonia, N. C., police disperse picket lines as "parades" and arrest strikers without cause.

In California, a man is sent to jail at Redwood City, San Mateo County, for three months, for selling a copy of Mrs. Margaret Sanger's pamphlet, "Family Limitation."

June

Rosika Schwimmer denied American citizenship because of her refusal to bear arms.

Dr. Douglas MacIntosh denied American citizenship because of unsatisfactory reply to the question, "If necessary, are you willing to take up arms in the defense of this country?"

Six-year-old child in Paintsville, Ky., found guilty of manslaughter and sentenced to fifteen years in the reformatory for shooting his playmate with his father's gun.

July

Meeting of the Workers' International Relief called to discuss Gastonia, N. C., trial and to raise funds for strikers' cause, is raided by Philadelphia police. Fifty persons taken to jail in patrol wagons, lodged in cells for the night, and discharged in the morning.

The Roosevelt High School of Los Angeles, a public institution, refuses a diploma of graduation to Max Rosenstein because he is a member of the Young Workers' League, a communist organization.

August

More than thirty-five halls and theaters in Boston refuse or ignore applications of peaceful and law-abiding committee to hold Sacco-Vanzetti memorial meeting.

September

Alfred Baker Lewis and Jackson Wales, speaking on the Boston Common about Sacco and Vanzetti, are forced by the police to relinquish their permit to speak and then arrested for speaking without a permit.

Gastonia, N. C., mob raids office of the International Labor Defense, destroys much property, kidnaps, beats and then releases three union leaders.

Mob of mill officials and employees fires into unarmed group of workers on their way to a union meeting and kills Ella May Wiggins, twenty-nine-year-old mill worker and mother of five children.

Eugene O'Neill's "Strange Interlude," Pulitzer prize-winner in 1928, banned from presentation by Theater Guild of New York in a Boston theater.

OCTOBER

Six striking mill workers, members of the American Federation of Labor, shot and killed by Marion, N. C., police for refusing to move away from in front of the mill. Four of the workers were shot in the back. None of the strikers fired a shot.

NOVEMBER

Iowa Supreme Court rules that liquor obtained without a search warrant may be used as evidence against a defendant.

National Broadcasting Company refuses to pollute its hook-up with the birth-control speeches of the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick and the Rev. V. B. Darlington before the American Birth Control League.

DECEMBER

Judge W. W. Cowen, at Clairsville, Ohio, sentences Tom Johnson and Charles Gwynn to jail for from five to ten years and Lil Andrews to an indefinite term in the State Reformatory for Women, for violating the state's Criminal Syndicalism Act. The two men tried to address a communist meeting at Martin's Ferry and the woman distributed pamphlets.

David and Miriam Weiss, high-school students, aged seventeen and fifteen respectively, arrested on a vagrancy charge for collecting funds in the New York subway for the Gastonia, N. C., strikers. Magistrate Sabbatino accuses the boy of having "a diseased mind," and says that what he needs is "some real American spirit," and that it might be imparted by blackening his eyes in a physical encounter in a small room.

RALPH L. WOODS.

Clear Night

Since love is brittle and precise
As wintry flower on narrow stalk,
Having the qualities of ice
And little of the enduring rock,

Since the clear flower and the stem
Will break beneath the heavy snow
A night that carved and bitter gem
Will not be up to watch them go,

Compatriots, conspirators,
Against this sharp and crystal pain,
Against this windless hour that pours
Stars down the hollowed sky like rain,

We shall be scornful and alert:
Each in his inner chrysalis
Armored against the mortal hurt,
Shall know the thing for what it is.

FRANCES M. FROST.

Washington Notes

ONE of the Hoover handicaps which I have mentioned before in this place is his curious unpopularity with the "corps of correspondents," those interesting and industrious persons through whom all the information and much of the misinformation concerning Washington affairs is filtered to the country. The reason this comes to mind at this time is because of an analysis recently made of the newspaper men who have gone to London with the American delegation to the naval reduction conference. I should say that approximately 80 percent of these are personally anti-Hoover, which means that they will not be personally grieved if his prestige is not improved by the conference result. While I do not mean to intimate that these men—anyhow, certainly not many of them—will knowingly permit their personal prejudices to color their cable dispatches, nevertheless, their personal attitude has a considerable effect upon conference atmosphere, and the lack of sympathy with the American thesis upon the part of a considerable number of the attending American journalists undoubtedly weakens the American position. The Hoover delegation—for that is what it is, despite the presence of Morrow and Dawes—will be in much the same position as was Lloyd George at the Geneva and Cannes conferences in the early years after the War, when the Northcliffe press was bitterly hostile to him. Anyone who has attended or observed an international gathering does not have to be told what a tremendous support a solidly coöperating and sympathetic press is in playing the national hand. The point I am making is that in London the American delegation will not have that sort of sympathy or coöperation from its own press. As neither the British nor the French press can be expected to offer it, ours will, I think, be the one delegation which conspicuously lacks this support.

While I still believe that the Hoover-MacDonald combination, backed by the wily Japs, will achieve an actual and concrete success in the shape of a battleship agreement which will save huge amounts and mark a real stride toward general disarmament, the newspaper situation is such that there seems to me slight possibility of any agreement being acclaimed at home as a worth-while accomplishment. Too many newspapers here have branded the conference a failure before it opened. Too many of our international publicists have staked their reputations upon its collapse. Too many erudite editors have called upon Mr. Hoover to save time, money and mortification by calling the conference off. A success—any kind of a success—would make fools of these "great organs of public opinion," their contributing editors and editorial writers. Whatever the result, it will be denounced by them. There is no way by which success can be achieved for them. The point I make, is that aside from the press associations and the New York papers, most of the American journalists at the gathering either represent newspapers which are cynical, hard-boiled and out of sympathy with the conference, or personally are in that condition, or both. This is, of course, because they are anti-Hoover, not anti-American, but it amounts to the same thing in London.

Exactly why Mr. Hoover should be so much less popu-

lar with Washington newspaper men than his little predecessor in the White House is more or less a puzzle to me. Partly, I suppose, it is because during the campaign the overwhelming bulk of them were strongly for the redoubtable Al, who had a singular flair for handling newspaper conferences, and a way with newspaper men that gained him the unstinted admiration of the undiscriminating mass of them. Partly it was due to the fact that in his campaign Hoover had so little aptitude for handling himself at these conferences that he discontinued them altogether, not, however, before a certain resentment had been engendered on both sides. Partly, I think, it is because Hoover, unlike Coolidge, has a half-dozen or so special friends among the correspondents, who have his confidence and personal regard. Mr. Coolidge had no particular friends among the newspaper men. They were all alike to him. To him they were just newspaper men, and as such they could be used to advantage. Yet when he left the White House, he and the correspondents almost kissed each other at the final press conference. A man who heard it told me it was one of the most ridiculous spectacles he had ever witnessed. It was a fine example of slush, and it is no tribute to the caliber of the correspondents that there were not more than half a dozen of them who saw the least humor in the situation.

When the time comes to part with Herbert Hoover there will, I am sure, be no such demonstration. Neither President nor press will register grief. Yet Hoover has treated the correspondents much more squarely than did the good Calvin, has made infinitely more news, talks to them with much more freedom, force and intelligence. Nor does he play favorites. I have not heard anyone suggest that the handful of his intimate newspaper friends have ever had from him news that was not available to everyone else. Notwithstanding all this, they do not like him—and one evidence is the way in which small White House happenings are played up to Mr. Hoover's embarrassment, whereas they were played up the other way for Calvin. It is an interesting situation, which so far seems not to have done him a great deal of harm in the country at large. On the other hand, no one will contend that it does him any good.

Before we get entirely away from the subject of the President and the press, I think it worth while to note that the Hearst press, with its big gun, Brother Brisbane, has reverted to type, has swung definitely away from the administration, and is lambasting the President in the good old Hearstian way. I always thought that one of the reasons Brother Brisbane so earnestly and consistently eulogized and supported Mr. Coolidge was that Mr. Coolidge was the only President he had ever had much chance to talk down to. During the Coolidge regime, he was a frequent White House guest, one of the regular Coolidge advisers and guides. He is not a frequent guest at the White House now; he is not a Hoover adviser or friend; and he has no chance at all of talking down to this President. Of course, there are the World Court and the London conference, both clashing with Hearst ideas, but these do not seem an adequate reason for the change from consistent Coolidge laudation to violent Hoover denunciation. I may do him an injustice, but just as I believed Brother Brisbane's personal vanity had no little to do with the extraordinary softness of the Hearst papers toward Coolidge and Mellon, I now have the notion that the same gentleman's personal prejudices are the principal factor in making the Hearst chain anti-Hoover. It is interesting, illuminating, but not important, that Mr. Brisbane should now be predicting a return of Calvin to the White House in 1932. It is not important, because Mr. Brisbane's political predictions are multitudinous but rarely reliable, and the absurdity of this one is too plain for serious discussion.

With the Progressive-Democratic coalition wobbling on the woolen schedules and various others, the tariff bill makes slow but fairly steady progress. It is not going to be a particularly good bill, but it is not going to be a particularly bad one. No party or faction in Congress will be completely satisfied if and when it finally goes through. Nor will Mr. Hoover be satisfied. The main point, however, seems to be that in the country as a whole interest in the bill is practically dead, with no chance at all of reviving it during the coming campaign. This fact, in my judgment, prevents what is happening now in the Senate in the matter of the tariff, or what will happen, from being politically significant one way or the other.

My speaking of politics again brings to mind the new Republican National Chairman, Mr. Claudius Huston of Tennessee and New York. Some weeks ago I mentioned here the mysterious "loan" of $80,000 for which Mr. Huston was sued by a prominent Oregonian, well known around Washington and New York and well liked. No details were given. There was but one publication of the suit in but one paper. It was a mystery about which Washington politicians speculated for days, and various curious stories were in circulation. I have now to report that the "loan" has been repaid—if not all of it, at least a sufficient part of it to justify the abandonment of the suit, which is said to have been definitely dropped. Nothing more will be heard of it, I am told. It is a closed incident.

Washington. T. R. B.

Song of Starlings

We've watched the starlings flocking past the statues
That we have often seen in other cities—
Hope, Justice, Commerce—and gathering round the cupolas,
Along the cornices, and have heard them sing.
Evening dims and we
May not return to where a lighted lamp
Beams, making a room familiar, and a wife
Tells of the children's doings; we hear the starlings
With their unvarying songs that bring us thoughts
We've had since childhood, since we first looked on
Clouds gathering and birds flying towards their home,
And saw around us bleak, monotonous fields
Our hearts must ever hold. We hear the starlings
As we have heard them often in other cities,
Round other cupolas, along other cornices,
Singing the songs that are their memories:
Memories of winds that they've been blown by,
And rivers bordered by their beds of sedges,
And level lands on which are empty folds:
Theirs are the songs that most touch us exiles.

PADRAIC COLUM.

Mostly the Actors

Meteor, by S. N. Behrman. The Guild Theater, December 23, 1929.

Waterloo Bridge, by Robert Emmett Sherwood. Fulton Theater, January 6, 1930.

MR. BEHRMAN'S third play—"The Second Man" and the adaptation of "Serena Blandish" were the other two—begins with some very distinguished and engaging work. All through the first act we see this college atmosphere, with its emptinesses, its vague professors, its athletes, and in the midst of all, that figure of Raphael Lord, who has come to Calvert College after reading a book by one of its professors, whose daughter he meets and falls in love with. This professor is dead, and the Uncle Avery who is left to fill his shoes is loved by Raphael, but easily transcended and abandoned. The young man's mind is full of his own powers; he has the gift of insight into the future; he wants life full and rich; he means to dazzle, to rule others, to depart, in fact, that very night for New York, leaving behind him the intangible virtues and pale mental avenues of the college, and setting out to make the world resound with him.

The other suitor for Ann's love is Sherman Maxwell, the football star, whose weak heart his brother, Curtis, means to conceal until a great professional contract has been fulfilled. Raphael is refused by Ann, though he is sure she loves him. He goes away, she sends for him to come back, which he does in time to meet Sherman Maxwell, tell him of his secret malady and see him die of rage and shock.

So far so good. Mr. Behrman writes with a most unusual taste, which is what most plays lack. The speeches are full of sense, too, are written with convincing reality, and achieve an effect of genuine intelligence where any mind is implied in the person speaking. The balance of the qualities is admirable, the movement of the scene forward is good. The characters of Ann and of the professor are soundly written out; the character of Raphael is a fresh piece of creation, full of possibility, variety and point, and conceived with imagination. This young man has been in prison, has wandered the roads, taken himself a name that will mask his real name forever, even from his wife. He is great and self-sufficient, he is frank and forward and clear when he expresses this center of himself, and illustrates most interestingly that saying of Madame de Maintenon's: frankness does not consist in saying a great deal, but in saying everything, and this everything is soon said when one is sincere, because there is no need of a great flourish and because one does not need many words to open the heart. This strange opening of a heart, so explosive, naïve and certain, gives a pathos to the character, he has the quality of a poet, a spiritual highwayman and a rash child. The people around him would like to change him to their own standards and shapes but adore him because he will not be changed. He is a red rag to some, an entertainment to others, an inescapable personality and persuasion to those on whom he most pours himself out. His future ought to smack of a good second or third act.

How beautifully Mr. Alfred Lunt understands all this! He establishes each of these characteristics of the man and of the situation with a careful technical attack and with an emotional understanding that no other actor on our stage would bring to it. Not a line is lost in its full value, and what might be fantastic or funny is given so right an exaggeration and excess that it becomes poetic, fanciful, pathetic, as well as heady and aggressive and young. Farce is closer to tragedy than comedy is, and this movement toward the farcical is the chief source of the pathos inherent in this first act of "Meteor."

After that first act the less said the better. Something happens to the play. One gets the impression of violent cutting of the original text, without the right contents having been transferred to the dialogue that remains. The result is that Raphael—it is five years later—is seen there in his house on Park Avenue—an apartment that, as we see it in Mr. Raymond Sovey's design, could not possibly have belonged to a mind so wayward, free and original, but looks rather like a swank place for the parade of mannequins in the newest frocks—he has succeeded beyond everybody's but his own wildest hopes, Wall Street is in the hollow of his hand, he longs for trials of his power, he has in his employ Curtis Maxwell, who hates him because of Raphael's part in his brother's death. Curtis is given great responsibility, for the pleasure of the danger implicit in that situation. A venture is going forward with new oil fields in South America. On the strength of the great Raphael Lord's endorsement, people have rushed to buy out the bonds. Meanwhile Ann, his wife, though she loves him, and though he loves her —the accents of this love motive are rather arbitrary in the play—is farther and farther from him. He drinks more, is busier, madder, more adventurous. And so on to the end, when Ann seems to leave him for good though he says she will come back, and when Fremont, his great rival in the oil fields, seems to be victorious, though at the last moment he seems to be coming round to Raphael's spell. What meaning there might be in these two acts, of mad power, megalomania, American stress and strain, love, friendship and the multitude, gets pretty much dissipated, and the drama wanders out of itself and into spotty confusion. Even so brief an account as I have made manages to give, by its very brevity, an impression of cogency that is not in the play itself.

Miss Lynn Fontanne, in a role that has some fine bases to it but a fragmentary writing and, for the actress, many lapses into a back seat, if not into oblivion before the blaze of Raphael's display, acts her part with feeling and understanding, and in the passages where she has anything to do, gives us as profound an interpretation as the author ever could have imagined. It is a role full of implications and yet curiously thankless, and to play it thus sincerely is the hallmark of an artist. Miss Fontanne and Mr. Lunt show all through the performance an accuracy and incessant care, an energy and a determination never to let down the current of feeling and dramatic event, that ought to make any dramatist thank them on his knees. I should hate to see the farcicalities and platitudes that would be put into "Meteor" by most actors.

Mr. Edward Emery as the old professor, benevolent,

humorous, indulgent, charming and wise, played with no little charm and understanding. He was well cast so far as the character went, though badly chosen for the prosperity of the play because of his inability to keep the ensemble going, to stay in the moment, to supply the responding vitality necessary to dialogue. There is, however, if you like, a certain truth in this vagueness of Mr. Emery's—Professor Avery himself would very likely have the same wandering lack of connection with what was going on around him, and would be likely to see himself as the same whimsical old darling. The loss to the play, nevertheless, remains, for the thematic balance that is supplied by the academic motive depends on this role.

Just for fun we may watch Mr. Lawrence Leslie play the villainous brother and false employee, Curtis Maxwell. I have not in a long time seen that sort of college-dramatics concentration, knotting of brows, fixed and eagle eye, that poise and general air of letting them have it. In all this tension and excess, it should be said, notwithstanding, there may be a very fair promise for later on.

There are some more or less interesting points in connection with Mr. Sherwood's new play, "Waterloo Bridge." The piece was evidently written in haste, the lines contain no meat of any kind and no dramatic diction, no dialogue with point, no speech that has any reality of any kind or any sort of edge; and yet, by virtue of its resting on a story that is safe stage platitude, and through the staking out of the curtains and main points in the story, a considerable effect of drama arises. It is all very dull but it stalks its way more or less evenly through all the stages till we reach the end.

In spite of the dullness and platitude, this new piece of Mr. Sherwood's is in one sense the best play he has done, which means that it is less uneven and less insecure than "The Road to Rome," for example, though "The Road to Rome" was worth fifty of it in any other sense. Such is the theater.

By cooking up a sufficient bouquet of situations and motives and mishaps for them, and letting the actors occupy the stage often enough, you can get a surprising return on a very small outlay of dramatic writing and idea. And though "Waterloo Bridge" remains rubbish, it is the well-scrutinized rubbish of an intelligent man, and so, at least, it does not block the actors' steps.

Miss June Walker plainly felt the dismal continuity of her case, and played without much conviction or spring, though her charms of voice and natural sincerity could not be wholly lost. Mr. Glenn Hunter, if one had never seen him before, might have seemed quite moving in his part of the young soldier, who, by his love, brings the young prostitute back to a good life—if we had ever seen him do any other part any other way, the same gaucheries, the same shiftings, the same rhythms, the same odd enunciation, and so on and so on. Most of the characterization of the role, therefore, was done by the producer who cast it, though Mr. Hunter's remarkable sense of timing, in his cues and in his whole dialogue of words and emotion, remains and does pretty much all of whatever is done for the part he is given.

STARK YOUNG.

Carl Sandburg and Photography

CARL SANDBURG'S introduction to "Steichen the Photographer" (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York), represents an opportunity wasted. The preface opened the door to an appreciation of an American art; but it reaches us full of the big bull talk passing for social intercourse in certain depressing sections of our land. He comes along, with that would-be Ossianic air, chucking phrases plugged with strong words like an old jaw with gold. "Steichen throws a long shadow, and ranks close to Ben Franklin and Leonardo da Vinci when it comes to versatility," he declaims; and suddenly the air grows faint and you feel strangely tired.

He begins his study of his photographic brother-in-law with a garbled and incomplete version of Steichen's relations with J. P. Morgan, Sr. The actual story is wonderfully revelatory of the Artist's relation with the American plutocracy. Sandburg, however, quite misses the beautiful point of the matter. Thereafter we learn that Steichen sleeps "as a child of Adam," that he "hunts ideas, old and new, gives long study to Chinese painters and the civilization back of their art . . . and learns all to be learned about the telepex, a machine that uses front and profile photographs to sculp figures with an accuracy of definition impossible to sculpture chiseling from life. He, whom Rodin called *'mon fils,'* telepexes himself and gets put on a page of Vanity Fair with other Machine Age sculptures. His own favorite photograph, 'The Wheelbarrow,' has statements that one could link with Einstein." At the end of this diverting discourse, we leave Steichen with a prophetic vision of him in his last hour, "dying and telling God that if he could live a few years longer he might be the photographer he wanted to be."

Yet flatulence is by no means the chief offense of Sandburg's introduction. Unfortunately he is not burbling for the sheer esthetic joy of it. In the middle of his song of Steichen the photographer, directly after telling us of the connection of his subject with a large, well known New York advertising agency, he quotes him to the effect that "there never has been a period when the best thing we had was not commercial art." And Sandburg adds:

> Michael Angelo . . . sold his work to a church of vast power, receiving generous sums of money from ecclesiastical patrons who approved the designs before they were executed. Lorenzo the Magnificent and similar plutocrats influenced the folkways of their time (as the millionaires of our day affect the crowd mind), granting commissions to Raphael, Titian, Botticelli, Leonardo da Vinci, who gave their most creative life moments to pictures that pleased their patrons. The captains of shipping and trade in Holland supplied the notable Dutch artists a chance to live during the years those Dutch artists evolved their various personal styles.

It will immediately be seen that the argument is tilted to deny spirit; to make it appear that the great artists did not work because of an impulse stronger than themselves which they dominated in their art, and which obtained

them the support of Julius II, the Medici, the Chigi and other eminent patrons; but rather because of the irresponsibility and jobbery that generate the main enemy of art, modern mercantile advertisement. The pretty picture: the Creation of Adam and the face of the Christ in the Last Supper arising out of the incentive to "sell" and to "succeed"; and "put across" with the connivance of popes and prelates! It would be sad enough, finding this denial in this particular context, were there no reasons for mourning other than the evidence that the idealistic Sandburg, the man who heard song and expression in tough American speech, through whom Chicago was full of gestation and splendor and spiritual force, is gone. But there is another and even more influential cause for our distress.

The photographic movement of which Steichen was himself a part, and in which he did his better work, ranks among the great American movements with spirit at their source. Indeed, no single esthetic or scientific or sporting event in the contemporary world arose out of a purer, less personal impulse than the photo-secession which has its culmination and fullest achievement in the snaps of Stieglitz, chief photo-secessionist and guide. In the nineties, he and his fellow printmakers found their medium in a state of servitude. By the beginning of the War, even before Stieglitz had shown it able to transmit and record man's deeper impulses no less directly than tone or color or stone, and capable of expressions either beyond its sisters' reach or never attempted by them, photography was an affranchised and autonomous means. While it is true that a direct feeling for life came close to making the photographs of the mid-Victorian Scotchman, David Octavius Hill, as independent of subject and as universal as masterly portraits in pencil and oil, his pioneer work was not built on by the succeeding generation. During the youth of the photo-secessionists, general practice still confined photography to the capture of superficial verisimilitudes, or the imitation of the work of painters. Even though an American resident in England, a certain Dr. P. H. Emerson, had obtained what Whistler called "some charming effects" with the camera, the movement toward independence and self-definition had to be reinitiated.

The active American group, which, besides Steichen and Stieglitz, included Gertrude Kaesebier, Clarence H. White, Frank Eugene, Paul Haviland, Alvin Langdon Coburn and others, did have the assistance of such progressive European photographers as Craig Annan, Max Kuehne and Baron Ad. de Meyer. Still, the work which transformed what had been called "photography" into a treatment of the photographic medium, and a fusion of subject and object by means of the photographic process, was mainly its own. Always a "straight" photographer, Stieglitz's prints from the first had form, composed as they were of balanced movements of projection and recession; and his entire trans-Atlantic group displayed the characteristically American material sense. While Stieglitz, mainly through the instrumentality of "Camera Work," acted as general director, Steichen played the bannerman. His gumprints were revolutionary for their time. Though they possessed neither the structurality nor the exquisite quality of Stieglitz's unmanipulated photographs, they had readily striking aspects, persistent after all the years of progress. To this day, Steichen remains a picture-maker of a most superior sort. His prints are bold, effective plaques, thrilling with their dashing, contrasting play of light and shade. The arrangements sometimes verge on the theatrical and the conceptions are not always original. The adaptations however, are brilliant and embody their subjects in terms of the medium. Steichen has a wonderful facility with suave lines and opulent textures, and a quick response to a certain type of feminine display. His penetrations are not always profound—witness the unfortunate conceit of photographing Bernard Shaw as "His Satanic Majesty." Yet numbers of his portraits, particularly those of celebrities, such as J. P. Morgan, Sr., Duse, Maeterlinck, Rodin, Isadora, Sandburg and H. L. Mencken, reveal a striking canniness. The chief defect of Steichen's use of his medium lies in a certain unresponsiveness, a tendency toward the showy and inflated. His place, after all, is with the virtuosi of the fiddle, the brush and the word.

The spiritual force that made the photographic medium thoroughly responsive and inclusive was hatched in another heart and brain; though Paul Strand, too, is to be credited with having done considerable to advance his art by perfecting its technique. Strand is consummately expert as far as development and printing go; and he is an original colorist, and at times a photographer of great power, weight and sharp definition. Certain of his strangely and sumptuously textured prints have a machine-like precision. It is unfortunate that many others are insufficiently "objective" and thing-like; failing of giving us satisfactory equivalents for the substances of rocks, woods, heads, plants and the other subjects; and bringing the focused shapes before our eyes in feeble relationships. It is a little as though the photographer's eagerness to make his creation self-definitive had rendered him timid in projecting himself into his subjects; and some of his prints resemble rectangular holes through which we look at the things the photographer should have represented. None the less, Paul Strand remains one of the chief hopes of his art, if not of all American work. Together with an immense ability, he has always demonstrated an uncompromising earnestness and idealism. He is indubitably hatching a respectable contribution of his own. What remains for the future to estimate is the amount and force of the achievement it adds to Stieglitz's, real liberator of his means.

A grandiose addition will not be readily forthcoming; as not only Paul Strand, but such other adventurers of the camera as Charles Sheeler, Man Ray and Ralph Steiner are letting us know. Indeed, Stieglitz's ever-increasing control of his medium and enlargement of his expression verge on the miraculous. His complete and "absolute" little prints have an almost unimaginable subtlety and vitality of line, color and shape. In his hands the photographic mechanism has recorded delicacies of gradation which brush and pencil can scarcely equal; and his gamuts of light are built of chromatic flakes of a fabulous exquisiteness and rarity. Stieglitz's photography is actually an originally powerful chiaroscuro, a dramatic play of innumerable states, qualities and intensities of radiance. It is a luminous relation of a daringly wide range and variety of stuffs; an immensely affecting release of novel form. He has bodied forth a strikingly personal inner world, possibly racial in its sorrowfulness, refinement and somber richness; certainly profoundly linked in its intensities and

accelerations, with the common one without. The very platey, acidulous, platinum-like quality of his surfaces is somehow perfectly characteristic of life into which steel machinery has entered full-force. And both the portraits and the "songs of the sky" roundly record the sharpened and complicated conflicts, the elusive harmonies and dizzy equilibrations, the rapid portentous birth and dissolutions of this fitful time.

Whence, the particular atrocity of Sandburg's denial of spirit in an essay dealing with American photography. Meanwhile, if the poet has failed of his job in "Steichen the Photographer," the printer has not. The reproductions that go to make up the body of the volume are excellent copy-work. And while suspecting that they still contrive to do these things better in Germany, we must be grateful for the decent level maintained by the Knudsen process.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Christian Science Censorship

SIR: Craig F. Thompson's article in The New Republic of December 11, on "The Christian Science Censorship," and your subsequent editorial comment, have earned and received the deep appreciation of thousands of Christian Scientists. An ever increasing number of persons recognize the very distinct difference between Christian Science as a constructive religion and Christian Science as a system of commercial exploitation by a small army of professional Christian Scientists.

To observe the enlightened trend of public thought as brought out in connection with the Christian Science boycott of Scribner's and the intimidation of booksellers who have dared to handle the Dakin biography of Mrs. Eddy, is cause for gratitude. It is only a question of time until public sentiment will be aroused to deal appropriately with this organization, which seeks by extra-legal methods to work its will upon editors, publishers, legislators and any others, who, it considers, stand in its way.

In the Manual of the Boston Mother Church is a by-law (Article 33, Section 2) under which its Committees on Publication are compelled *"immediately to apply for aid to the Committee on Business"* when an editor shows reluctance to publish what an official Christian Science press representative demands to have appear. The story of the stultifying effects, on a substantial part of the press, of this organized system of coercion, would constitute a tale that would make this latest boycott seem insignificant by comparison.

Washington, D. C. A. M. VICKERY.

SIR: Aware of the fact that a campaign is being waged against the legitimate sale of Edwin Franden Dakin's biography of Mary Baker Eddy, published by Charles Scribner's Sons, a reputable firm, and knowing furthermore that this campaign has reached Detroit, where every large bookstore refuses to display this volume, we, the undersigned, who are constant purchasers of various kinds of books, pledge ourselves to deal only with those bookstores in Detroit not fostering this censorship, or to purchase our books directly from the publishing houses. We call on all people who are sincere in their fight for freedom of speech to join with us in this fight.

MAURICE PEARLSTEIN, REBEKAH ROSENZWEIG, R. CARP, HELEN B. GOLDBERG, DORIS SPERLING, RAY SIRIT, MARY ELKIN, F. C. GOLDSMITH, E. WALLACK, J. LITTLE, D. HAZEN, M. E. WILLIAMS, HENRY FEINBERG, AARON WEISWASSER, MINNA FAUST, HARRY KASS, SAUL L. COHEN.

Detroit, Mich.

Anti-Americanism in Toronto

SIR: I am enclosing a clipping of an editorial comment of The Toronto Star on the article by William York, "As a Canadian Sees Us," which appeared in the December 4 issue of your magazine. I did not see the entire article and I am sorry, for I know I should have relished it to the last period. However, I am taking this opportunity to voice the tribulations of an American exiled in Toronto, where the feeling against the Americans is so intense that it is sometimes cruel.

My husband and I came to Canada over six years ago. He was sent here by the company for which he worked, to be their Canadian manager. This company operates a factory and general office employing Canadians, my husband being the only American in the Canadian branch.

In Montreal the feeling against Americans was not very much in evidence. The French-Canadians and the English are so busy disliking each other they have no time or energy left to dislike a mere American. For five years we felt no ostracism whatever. My husband and I spoke French and we numbered our friends among both nationalities. We liked Canada and said so whenever our vacations took us to our homeland.

About eighteen months ago we were transferred to Toronto and we looked forward to the change with much pleasure. Everyone told us what a lovely home town Toronto was, and the English people in Montreal said I would feel more at home there than in any other city in the Dominion.

We moved into a fashionable neighborhood, an incorporated village on the outskirts of the city. We did not select the house ourselves, as another member of the company, a Canadian, made all the arrangements for us. It was not until we were settled in our home that we realized just how thick the society cream was. By some occult sense, the neighbors knew we were not one of them, and worst of all, we were "some of those awful Americans." When we made our appearance around the house, those living in the near vicinity occupied themselves with tasks that would not necessitate their looking in our direction.

I have always been a social animal, and my social status in life has never been so precarious that I had to have the pedigree of my neighbor before I could bid him the time of day. I did my best to be friendly and neighborly with the people around me, but the absence of any such feeling on their part made me withdraw into my own shell to wait until they came to me. I have lived in the same house with the same neighbors for eighteen months, and with one exception, a Canadian lady married to an American, I have yet to have them bid me "Good day," much less carry on a conversation with me. I doubt if some of them know my name. Among my neighbors I have two retired Episcopalian ministers and two women who are active workers in their respective churches, but their Canadian Christianity does not include the American stranger within their gates.

This state of feeling does not bother me or my husband. We are able to apply our sense of humor to the situation, and have resources within ourselves that make up for the lack of our neighbors' society. But we have a small son who bears the burden of being American. He had never been taught the difference in nationality, and his attempts at play with these children met with little encouragement. When we had been here about two months he came in and asked me what an "American" was. It was a pretty hard thing to explain to a three-and-a-half-year-old boy, particularly when I knew that he had no doubt been taunted with it. The children of his own age have more or less overlooked the stigma of his nationality, but when any of the mothers invite the children into their homes, he is either left out entirely or sent home. He cannot understand why this should be, for in his desire to have playmates he will do almost anything for them.

This situation is not true of myself alone. Two other American friends who live in other parts of the city have the same thing to contend with. One of them has lived in her neighborhood for the same length of time I have in mine, and she has yet to be received by any Canadian families. Even in school her children have been made to feel that they are just beyond the pale. I could go on at length with incidents that have happened to me

and my friends, but this will serve to let you know that William York knows what he is talking about.

Toronto, Canada. AN AMERICAN IN EXILE.

The Malden Pilgrims

SIR: Your correspondent, Mr. Talcott Miner Banks, seems to be very much perturbed by the recent pilgrimage to the cemetery at Malden. I wonder what he thinks of the never-ending pilgrimages to Mount Vernon and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington. If he is consistent, these, too, must appear to him as utterly "foreign." To most of us, however, they are merely "human," an evidence of our belief in the theory (naïve it may be) that loyalty and devotion to ideals may be "bred in processions and nourished by pilgrimages to 'shrines'."

As to his concern about "how much these 800,000 Malden 'pilgrims' will help us in carrying on the self-governing Commonwealth in which we and they live together," he might follow the advice of a great American who once made a remark to the effect that there is no way of judging by the future but by the past. Judging by the World War record of the group to which he refers, our country need have no fear of their future defection. The brethren of the Malden "pilgrims" who lie buried in the soil of France have given an unmistakable answer to the query he raises.

Washington, D. C. EDWARD B. JORDAN.

SIR: As one who thoroughly appreciates The New Republic, may I express my opinion of the letter by Talcott Miner Banks, which appears in this week's issue.

Mr. Banks designates present-day Massachusetts as a Puritan Commonwealth. What authority has he for so doing? It is true that the Puritan spirit of repression still prevails among legislators of the old Bay State in their ridiculous censorship of literature and drama, and their opposition, dying though it be, to Sunday recreation. But Massachusetts is in the main a progressive state. Its legislators are, generally speaking, liberals, because the "pilgrims" of Malden believe in liberal government, not the 100 percent American type, anti-social, anti-progressive, in vogue in 100 percent American states. Dear old North Carolina! The liberal leaders of Massachusetts come from the ranks of the Malden "pilgrims" or they are elected by that group. They are not taught to make a virtue of hypocrisy.

And when, may I ask, did Puritanism develop this grand old virtue of self-reliance? In the acts of the witch-burners, the men of God and guardians of public morals, the Watch and Ward Society, the blue-law experts, or in the ravings of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy? No, Mr. Banks, Massachusetts has been benefited by "foreigners" since 1845, and thanks to the foreigners, she can still keep her head up when she looks at sister states. The wave of religious emotionalism which has swept over New England in recent months is not an uncommon phenomenon, so it need not cause much worry. What with Christian Science, voodooism, spiritualism and the good, old-fashioned evangelical Protestant cures which Sinclair Lewis describes so ably in "Elmer Gantry," Malden needs only passing comment.

I, too, enjoyed the account of the Malden miracles in The New Republic. The article was capably written, dispassionately, and there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the facts presented.

West Philadelphia, Pa. BRENDAN O'DWYER.

Is Prohibition a Catholic Principle?

SIR: In your issue of December 11, Thomas Addis Tone has a letter in which he upholds the thesis that the legal prohibition of intoxicating liquor is a Catholic, rather than a Protestant, principle, because it is in the Catholic Church that "so many other prohibitory and restrictive laws still find a natural home." This is plausible, but superficial. It fails to distinguish between kinds of prohibitions or between kinds of Protestantism, and it confuses total prohibitions with partial prohibitions, that is, with mere regulations and restrictions. The differences which Mr. Tone overlooks are more important than the resemblances which he emphasizes.

The first difference between the legal prohibition of liquor and the various prohibitions which are laid down for the faithful by the Catholic Church is that the former is imposed upon all citizens by the power of the state, whereas the latter are imposed only upon those persons who freely accept them because they accept the Catholic Church. No non-Catholic citizen of the United States, nor even any Catholic citizen who disregards these Church prohibitions, will fall under the penalties of a Volstead Act, or a Jones Act, or any similar instrument of legal coercion. This difference is of considerable practical importance to the Catholic, as well as to the non-Catholic.

The second difference which Mr. Tone fails to note is that the Church prohibitions which he recounts are either partial, as in the case of the use of meat on Fridays and fast days and the Lenten regulations generally, or prohibit actions which are forbidden by Christ or by the moral law. The most nearly exact parallel between any of the Church prohibitions mentioned by Mr. Tone and legal prohibition is provided by the law requiring abstinence from meat. Conceivably, the Church might have prohibited the use of meat entirely, just as the American State prohibits completely the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. As a matter of fact, the Church has confined the meat prohibition to certain days, just as the American State formerly prohibited the liquor traffic on certain days and hours. To the Catholic, the difference between legal prohibition and the law of abstinence from meat is very great, indeed. The Catholic also finds a very considerable difference between Church prohibitions of actions which are forbidden by Christ or by the moral law and a prohibition which is aimed at an entirely lawful action, namely, the consumption of intoxicating liquor.

The third difference neglected by Mr. Tone is that which is found among different branches of Protestantism. By their origin and traditions, the Lutherans and the Anglicans, or Episcopalians, should naturally be opposed to such a restriction upon individual liberty as legal prohibition. Possibly the majority of them exemplify faithfulness to those traditions in their attitude toward the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. But the Protestant churches which carry on, or have adopted, the Calvinistic and the Puritan traditions are in an entirely different category. Religious denominations which are capable of regarding as essentially evil dancing, card playing and betting, do not have far to go in order to take the same attitude toward intoxicating liquor. In other words, the minute regulations and prohibitions of personal conduct which are found in what may be called the Puritan churches make them "the natural home" of the prohibition dogma. Among these churches, the principal are Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists and Disciples of Christ. Taken together, they are sufficiently powerful and sufficiently vocal to suggest that American Protestantism has committed itself to legal prohibition.

Moreover, the inheritor of the Puritan tradition quite naturally calls upon the state to adopt and enforce his views of conduct and of moral discipline. He is not moved by theories of individual freedom or personal rights against state tyranny; for he assumes that he has the duty of reforming and uplifting his neighbor, regardless of any childish notions which the latter may entertain under the head of personal freedom.

Washington, D. C. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

Improving on Mr. Hurley

SIR: Mr. Hurley's proposal that the task of preserving peace among nations be left in the hands of a committee of the world's great industrial leaders is at least unique. But if it is to be adopted, there is one additional provision that ought to be included.

Should war break out in spite of their great efforts, the next best thing to do would be to round up these industrial giants and put them in the front-line trenches. Through the aid of this strategic position we cannot doubt an armistice would be signed overnight.

F. S. KINDER.

Albuquerque, N. M.

Conrad Aiken

Selected Poems, by Conrad Aiken. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 361 pages. $3.50.

MR. AIKEN'S poetry is all alike and has been often complained of, on that account, by dull readers; the vehemence of that complaint is the measure of those readers' loss. Shelley is all alike, and Swinburne; there is a unity in their respective inspirations which is the more strongly felt the closer the reader's acquaintance. It is difficult to be familiar enough with the work of a living poet such as Mr. Aiken; he is likely either to repel us by resembling us too much, or, on the contrary, to deceive us with too great an air of strangeness; so that we never get very near him except by the *tour de force* of some kind of objective criticism. By publishing in a single volume the bulk of his poems, Mr. Aiken invites such a *tour de force*.

We must explain the alikeness, that is the identity, of his work by first separating it into unlike components, and, having understood them, by then performing that recomposition which is judgment. What would be most surprising in such an analysis would be the event of these unlike components being unfamiliar or difficult to conceive; it is much more probable that they would turn out to be merely a concentrated form of some of the conventions already furnishing our own minds. So it is with Mr. Aiken. Not only his theme but the attitude from which he treats it belong naturally to our common atmosphere. We have not only the same instincts, but the same education, almost the same preoccupation.

If we turn back to Mr. Aiken's novel, "Blue Voyage," for even a cursory reading, the heart of his problem is laid distressingly bare. The protagonist of that book, who for present purposes is Mr. Aiken, is looking at once for himself and for the infinite, and he finds the one in the other, interchangeably. His mood and his method are those of the artist. The novel is the prose version of the poems. In the novel, we get the psychology, and the philosophical notions behind it, in an almost pure form; in the poems these are translated into symbols, images and music. In both, the poet is preoccupied with the Blue Voyage or Great Circle Passage of the soul, the *voyage à l'infini*, the exploration of his own heart. He holds with Sir Thomas Browne, "We carry with us the wonders we seek without us: there is all Africa and her prodigies in us; we are that bold and adventurous piece of nature, which he that studies wisely learns in a compendium, what others labor at in a divided piece and endless volume."

Three influences have combined in varying proportions to foster this theme, which was Mr. Aiken's, or any poet's, by instinct. He grew up with the science of psychology, with the extension into common experience of the notions of fantasy and neurosis. For Mr. Aiken the expression of experience results from a neurosis in the mind and takes the form of a fantasy. The analysis of emotions with which the poems are so largely occupied is based upon, but it is not equivalent to, the kind of analysis found in the contemporary treatment of the father-complex, for example, or ego-mania. Modern psychology, then, is responsible for much of the material of the poems; it lends meaning to many of his words, and creates, often, the substance of his experience, the drama of his poetry. From this point of view, poems are purges; they get rid of, by putting into the form of fantasy, the burden of life for the individual, and further, they fill the hollow of the individual by the fantasy of all possible experience.

There is a sense in which the central notions of psychoanalysis are very much akin to the transcendental idealism of the last century. Both are forms of a single egocentric insight. It is natural that a poet, who can hardly depend on science alone, should fall back upon the philosophy of which his science is a variant. It is easy to show, by chapter and verse, that any one of Mr. Aiken's longer poems is an expression of philosophical idealism. There is even an argument to the original edition of "The Pilgrimage of Festus" which asserts that the poem deals with the problem of epistemology in idealistic terms. What strikes a mind familiar with, but not fuddled by, the essential notions of that philosophy, is how much better poetry than doctrine it produces. Here, in poetry, the accents of solipsism ring true. Experience taken as vicarious, as arising only in the mind and only because of the mind, seems profound and illimitable. It is soaked in the colors of the personality. No qualm of the soul but seems overwhelming, an index to the infinite.

It will be immediately observed that, despite their subject matter and their inspiration, Mr. Aiken's works read like neither psychology nor philosophy. This is partly because of the very important influence, aside from the two already described, which has been exerted upon all but the latest of Mr. Aiken's poems by his sense of music. Music is the only form of art which is absolutely one's sole possession. This is why the counterpart of transcendental philosophy was music. It is also the fact inspiring Pater's dictum that all arts tend to the condition of music. But poetry cannot be absolute in this sense; it cannot altogether escape the meanings of its words. Approximations are a form of madness; but are sometimes divine. Parts of Mr. Aiken's poems are as near music as long poems on a serious, abstract theme can be.

Until the most recent of the poems here reprinted, these three influences—modern psychology, idealism and the sense for music—have worked in two radically different ways, so that Mr. Aiken's poems divide themselves sharply into two kinds, the lyrical and the dramatic, though sometimes, as in "The House of Dust," a single long poem is so divided. If we take the latest and as it happens the purest examples of the two styles and set them up for comparison, a pretty good notion should emerge of what Mr. Aiken has been about. Parenthetically, it should be observed that the choice of two poems of comparatively late date does not imply that the qualities found in either are not also found in earlier works.

It is important to note that "The Pilgrimage of Festus" was published in August, 1923, and that "Electra" was written in 1924. Thus it is impossible to consider the striking difference between them as due to any growth or progress of the poet's mind. The two poems must present reverse sides of the same coin—the only one in Mr. Aiken's currency.

The difference between the two poems consists, perhaps, in the presence and the absence of language as music. Music, when it is in poetry, is often tenuous. It is overtone. It leaves its substance. There is an astonishing tenuity, a rarefaction without dilution, in "Festus" which no considerable poet has approached since Swinburne. The image of all experience is raised into the figure of a man, then expanded, developed, varied in a multitude of lyrical suggestions, and brought finally to a resolution in the repetition of the original two-page theme. The progress of the poem is such that when the two pages that begin the poem are read again at its end, what had first seemed definite evocation is now but an overtone of the world. Color-words such as scarlet, crimson, green, black, and

poetic words such as flute, horn, cloak, dew, moon, wind, time, dust, abound as ornament and filling to the poem. In passages which would otherwise be definite such words appear for the evident purpose of creating vagueness. An example of this sort of verse at its best appears on page 274:

> I am about you as the darkness is:
> Softly within me, ghost of light,
> Turn and turn, amaze me with your beauty;
> Be in me as the firefly in the night.

Here the charm of the figure is undeniable and is due to its vagueness. But we also find many lines such as one where a woman is said to "tower, cold and blue as a caryatid." Generally, in this poem, words and tropes are used for their own sakes, as objects by themselves with the minimum reference to their meanings. Similarly, the experience with which the poem deals is fantasy for its own sake. The poet is concerned overtly with his sensibility in the easiest sense of that word, with the history of his sensations, strung out, repeated, played on endlessly.

The sum of adverse criticism is well put by Santayana: "A poet who merely swam out into the sea of sensibility, and tried to picture all possible things, real or unreal, human or inhuman, would bring materials only to the workshop of art; he would not be an artist." But at its worst, Mr. Aiken's verse quivers when you touch it, alive with what lies, half-stifled, but all-important under the gaudy rhetoric of sense. A poem like "Festus" will hardly, without outside support, seem very concrete. It was not meant to. It expresses beautifully the overtones of reality; and sometimes those overtones seem the limits of knowledge.

Our difficulty is that we increasingly distrust such poetry, and in some moods cannot even read it; it smacks too much of the bird or the bard; we are afraid of it, not because it expresses us too well, but because it expresses us too easily. By a reverse sentimentality we are ashamed of what we understand too easily. There is the suspicion that what we understand is either trivial or misconceived, and we feel that the conventional language, the ornamental rhetoric, in which this poetry is clothed can be too easily employed by charlatans. Mr. Aiken himself shares and has always shared this distrust. If we examine the second poem chosen, "Electra," we shall see the kind of poetry which this distrust breeds.

In "Festus," the psychology is buried, or lost, in the tenuity of the music. In "Electra," or any of the last six poems in the book, it stares you in the face, while the music is buried, exists rather in the logic of the poem. Instead of being entirely suggestive, the images are condensed and precise. That is, the suggestion is controlled, limited.

> "Under this water-lily knee" (she said)
> "Blood intricately flows, corpuscle creeps,
> The white like sliced cucumber, and the red
> Like poker-chip."

In the poem as a whole, the words, instead of being employed for the sake of their emotional overtones, as the objects of poetry themselves, are used more to define feelings. The words are used as the substance of knowledge. Again, the notion of fantasy in such a poem as "Festus" was used to hold a collection of possibilities, to represent the poet's vicarious experiences, and the definite was only a vague idea implied by the whole. In "Electra," on the other hand, the poem works a definite experience into such a fantasia as to imply the vicarious. Here the poem is really a purge for some particular drama or experience. The new accent and the old inspiration are clearly combined in the last five lines of the poem:

> Something of which the moon contrived the surface
> While blood beneath supplied the essence gross.
> Useless! for it was spilled as soon as brimmed.
> Prince Ferdinand was dead, Arachne dead,
> The blood unmoving, and the moonlight vain.

Mr. Aiken has not actually changed a jot. Merely his later poems have substituted one set of accents for another. As it happens, most people today prefer the harsh, precisely suggestive, psychological poetry he is now writing to the earlier lyrical, vaguely suggestive pieces. It is a matter of taste, and amounts to liking fifty pages better than three hundred. But the taste may be wrong and may be corrected. One thing to remember is that, had not Mr. Aiken written the long lyrical poems, with their enormous suggestive power, he could not have managed in "Electra" so fine a phrase as this:

> How seductive of the palm
> That flatters with the finest tact of flesh!

R. P. Blackmur.

Marriage and Morals

Marriage and Morals. by Bertrand Russell. New York: Horace Liveright. 320 pages. $3.

Sincerity is a virtue which can exist at different levels and is to be esteemed accordingly. It is easy to think sincerely about the weather, perhaps not so hard to think sincerely about the stock market or the Republican party, perhaps hardest of all about the moral problems of sex. Sincerity of mind alone will never open the gates of understanding, but when it is combined with the large humanity and the philosophic grasp which belong also to Mr. Russell, the result is a challenge to our age from which we cannot lightly turn aside.

Mr. Russell calls his book "a contribution to sexual morality." His quarrel with the professional moralist, who at the present day is "a man of less than average intelligence," is that the moralist wants to base morality on a deliberate suppression of the truth. He believes in veils and censorships, in tales of the stork and laws suppressing knowledge of birth control, in the prohibition of the spontaneous joys which sex can bring and in the retention of the needless sorrows (including the scourge of venereal disease) which ignorance or folly has attached to sex. From these atavistic taboos, accepted by minds which fear nature and happiness and even life itself, comes the unclean superstition of the uncleanness of sex, come furtive evasions, unwholesome concealments and moral and physical tragedies. The beginning of wisdom is not fear but fearlessness. The natural questioning of the child should meet with a natural response. The natural desire of adults should not suffer the coercion of society save in so far as definite harm to others results. The only rational ground for social control over marriage is the welfare of offspring. Childless sex relations are in themselves no concern of society nor should they be controlled by the state. Adultery which does not involve procreation is not its affair, nor should it even, by itself, be an admissible ground of divorce. On the other hand, Mr. Russell deplores the social taboo which does not permit women "whom arithmetic compels to remain single"

from having children if they want to and are in a position to take care of them.

To those who rise in horror at these proposals and declare that their acceptance would undermine society, Mr. Russell answers calmly that this is precisely what the current doctrine, with its policeman's view of life, is doing. We are preaching a sex morality which may have been conformable to the social and economic conditions of the old "religious proprietary family"—to use the neat characterization of Professor Giddings—but which is assuredly out of accord with the practice of the age in which we live. If the old won't believe it, the young know it. The unhappy union of ignorance and suppression has begotten grave distempers, of which the excessive divorce rate of the United States is one symptom. It officially degrades love into duty, reduces sex to the sexual act, and thereby checks its free blossoming into the finer and richer union which is "the most fructifying of all human experiences." It leads on the one hand to the joyless refuge of work-asceticism and on the other to that cynical reaction of the emancipated towards sex which is illustrated by the characters of Aldous Huxley. It induces the same kind of unhealthy stimulation which prohibition has created in respect to alcohol.

The argument is developed with fine lucidity. It is the work of one who has studied much and reflected deeply. It is pointed with that social irony which only the demands of pure mathematics ever banish from Mr. Russell's style. But behind the irony lie a strong conviction and a clear vision. There are some eminently debatable contentions in Mr. Russell's exposition, but it is hard to see how any intelligent reader can dispute its intellectual courage and its essential sanity. Mr. Russell has done what he set out to do—he has made "a contribution to sexual morality."

One suspects, however, that Mr. Russell is temperamentally apt to view moral and social attitudes in detachment from the social conditions within which they arise. For example, he regards the stark ascetic teachings of St. Paul (I Cor. v. 1) as giving a powerful impetus towards restrictive sex morality. But why should this teaching have been accepted so much more completely by the Christian church than Christ's own teaching about the woman taken in adultery, except that it corresponded to the trend inherent in the social and economic conditions of the patriarchal family? Again, in dealing with the frequency of divorce in America, Mr. Russell lays stress on the explanation that "what people seek in marriage is not what should be sought, and this in turn is due partly to the fact that adultery is not tolerated." There may, however, be more important explanations which he does not mention. It is significant that the divorce rate increases as we move from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It is significant that Russia and Japan take rank next to the United States. Such facts suggest a different mode of interpretation, in terms of the clash or disappearance of traditions. As another example of Mr. Russell's tendency to appraise human conduct in some detachment from the underlying conditions, we might refer to his belief in the uncanny power of the state to change things, which is so characteristic of his little prophetic book "Icarus." In the present volume he assigns to an international government the business of passing decrees to regulate the birth rate of military nations. This temperamental quality is perhaps an asset to the social reformer, though it has disadvantages in the scientist. And it adds something to the provocative character of a truly important book.

R. M. MacIver.

The New Germany

The New German Republic, by Elmer Luehr. New York: Minton, Balch and Company. 442 pages. $5.

THE tensions of revolution and regeneration in Germany have furnished for ten years a register of European development. Autocracy and democracy, communism and socialism, nationalism and internationalism have here fought their way to equilibrium. The treaty which gave to Europe such extensive rights of intervention in German affairs made Germany a focus of European politics. Therefore, a study of the German republic must also be an epitome of recent European diplomatic history.

Mr. Luehr has risen to this double task. In compiling the internal history of Germany, he picks his way carefully through treacherous controversial problems and conflicting evidence. He disposes once more of the myth that the revolution stabbed the army in the back, but hints that it may have made the work of the Armistice Commission more difficult. He is no more successful than other writers have been in bringing provincial politics into the national picture. He probably underestimates the significance of the slogan "Los von Berlin," and fails adequately to evaluate Prussian opposition to the Preuss draft of the constitution, which was voiced very definitely in the Prussian *Landtag*. His discussion of the constitution supplants other works in English, because it describes the practical working of the instrument, where others have been content to analyze the language of the document. It appears, for instance, that the president has not actually made use of the power of calling for a referendum which the political theorists deemed so important, but has built up his influence rather by manipulating party combinations in Cabinet crises.

The calmness with which Mr. Luehr describes the internal history of the revolution deserts him when he writes of Germany's treatment at the hands of the Allies. And with reason. But it is to be regretted that he drops so near to pamphleteering style. The injustices of the Treaty speak louder when they are allowed to speak for themselves. In denouncing the Treaty of Versailles, the author has a way of mixing indiscriminately great things and small, fact and homily. Sometimes his views are stated in a kind of broken English which reads like a hasty translation from some foreign language leaflet:

> The Allies curtly changed German citizens into Belgians, although international practice is different. Nationality is a juridic conception and is a voluntary status. A temporary denial of the classification is a breach of law.

This language not only lacks clarity, but also fails to touch the heart of the injustice of the Eupen-Malmedy settlement to which it refers, for the injustice lay in the violation of the principle of nationalities rather than in the regulations for the option of citizenship by the residents of the transferred territory. Mr. Luehr does not fail to point out the more serious injustice, but in this as in other instances he weakens his case against the Allies by an uncritical organization of material.

Nevertheless, his is an important and useful study of affairs both foreign and domestic, which leaves the reader with the impression that German policies have been in this decade more consistent, more dignified, more enlightened, and (with due account being taken of the means at her disposal) more successful than in any decade since Bismarck left the stage.

Robert C. Binkley.

Bolitho's Adventures

Twelve Against the Gods, by William Bolitho. New York: Simon and Schuster. 351 pages. $4.

THE ill-advised insistence of Messrs. Simon and Schuster on the coupling of Mr. Bolitho's name with an adjective ordinarily reserved for Mr. Beerbohm, whom I admire, and the ecstatic and oft-repeated encomiums of Mr. Woollcott, whom I do not, led me to approach "Twelve Against the Gods" with the gravest misgivings. They were only partially justified. Mr. Bolitho has gathered together a dozen of the world's great on the grounds that they are all adventurers—and, as such, have—once the spell of their personalities has gone—failed. Adventure, to Mr. Bolitho, is not what it is to Mr. Kipling and Mr. Chesterton and our Mr. Christopher Morley: it is not, in short, a walk around the block or even playing tag in the Rambles. It is the enemy of society; "the adventurer is an outlaw. Adventure must start with running away from home." Everyone is born an adventurer, but few escape conformity as they grow up.

From these few Mr. Bolitho has selected Alexander, Casanova, Columbus, Mahomet, Lola Montez, Cagliostro, Charles XII of Sweden, Napoleon I, Catiline, Napoleon III, and bringing up the rear, Isadora Duncan and Woodrow Wilson. There is something cheap in the juxtaposition of the chaste Alexander and the notorious Casanova, religious leader and actress, dancer and president. Mr. Bolitho is a journalist: he knows how to get his effects. He proves his point about adventurers; all his subjects fit in with his definition, but so would a great many others. One feels that he has made use of a generalization in order to string together a few glittering personalities in what seems, at first glance, a strikingly paradoxical fashion. His interpretation is clever, but there is a great deal that anyone who knows history would find repetitious. However, it is not at all likely that this will affect the sale of the book.

Mr. Bolitho's method of expression has been accorded high praise. Some of his remarks have an original flavor to them, as "Giacomo Casanova was the eldest son of a futile and charming fellow, an actor of Venice with a cuckoo's idea of rearing a family"; but many of them are very nearly unintelligible. Mr. Bolitho can get more balled up in a short sentence than anyone else I have ever read. For example: "In mere geography this vast antagonist, or prize, that Alexander chose, was in this sense the world, that is, it was its core, the hub of the three old continents." In spite of this often atrocious style an alert mind is revealed. It is a pity that anyone capable of writing an essay as interesting as the one about Catiline should have such a horror of lucidity.

GEOFFREY T. HELLMAN.

The Midas of Barra

The House of Gold, by Liam O'Flaherty. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

FROM the moment we find Francis O'Neill waiting in the darkness of Black Cliff for the beautiful wife of Ramon Mor Costello, tyrant merchant and landlord of the Irish seacoast town of Barra, until at last the gigantic feudal overlord and his wife are dead and the wild lover is carried off in handcuffs, O'Flaherty's story moves with the headlong speed of tragic melodrama. The tale begins on a pitch of intensity which, were it continued longer, would shatter the credulity of the reader. The characters, already heavily weighted with symbolical values, come close to assuming the obvious properties of Sophoclean drama, yet O'Flaherty's skill is revealed as soon as he brings his men and women down from the cloudy precipices of passion upon which their first scenes are played, and mingles them with the earthy folkways of Barra. With the patience of Joyce in "Dubliners," yet with heavier strokes of emphasis and contrast, he reproduces the minds and voices of his peasants and so invests an almost fabulous legend of lust, impotence, jealousy and defeat with the realism its circumstances and backgrounds require.

However much one mistrusts the violence of this action, and the ardor with which O'Flaherty drives home his indictment of the avarice and superstition upon which the vine of this tragedy takes root, no one can deny his gift for creating the terror of impending doom, or for generating from the fires of passion and hatred a high and absolute lyric beauty. The condensation of action into the space of a single day robs "The House of Gold" of the steady cumulative excitement which gave "The Informer" its strength; it is only through dexterity that the six central characters are kept above the confusion of country life and so retain the value with which, in their first isolation, they were endowed. O'Flaherty is able to devise tragic grandeur; with Robinson Jeffers he shares a mastery of a heroic manner essentially Grecian in its scope and somber majesty. Unlike Jeffers, he does not develop this grandeur to the neglect of actual human problems and motives, for he exceeds the American poet in the variety of his *genre* pictures, and in his humor. That he permits his social prejudices to become obsessions which never allow his stories to attain the sympathy and insight of Synge's or O'Casey's plays is to be regretted, for while the sweep and range of his dramatic genius is remarkable, his verdicts lack the lucidity of a wide and generous human understanding. With O'Casey and Joyce, however, he makes us realize anew the singular richness of his subject matter—its diversity and humor, its poetic charm and fluency, and the continuous warfare of absurdity and noble pathos which the peasant character displays at every turn.

"The House of Gold" is not O'Flaherty's most convincing novel thus far, but it extends the dimensions of his former work. It reveals the creative authority with which he builds up and controls an elaborate dramatic scheme, and the genuine poetic imagination whereby he illuminates it. The presence of these qualities emphasizes in the present novel its failure to achieve the clarity and logic his previous books have led us to demand.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL.

Notes on Novels

Coals From Newcastle, by Bruce Beddow. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

BRUCE BEDDOW possesses an instinct for original character and story that asserts itself with considerable tenacity, but his hand is weak and frequently wavers badly. In the course of the rather long "Coals From Newcastle," the author commits at one time or another nearly every banality known to novel-writing, without, however, losing sight entirely of his strongly conceived character, George Rudd, or of many verities of English mining life which form the novel's background. George Rudd is a coal factor who has risen to comparative wealth from the ranks of the miners, among whom in his youth he had been a fire-brand of unionism. This metamorphosis, in

the light of Rudd's physical ugliness and the frustrations that accompany it, seems logical, and especially humanizes the factor. The novel opens in the springtime, when Rudd is uneasily stirred by his annual impulse to love. Casually beginning where he had left off the year before, he is perfunctorily rejected by the spinster Alice Hardy, and is left free to fall in love with the first woman whom he meets. This proves to be the seventeen-year-old Josephine Taylor, so young in experience that to her George is hardly more than a fixture, like her father. Her rejection of him when he proposes marriage, and Rudd's half-consciously evolved scheme of seducing her so that she will be compelled to marry him, makes drama that escapes banality by the way in which the author reveals the powerful, naïve, self-torturing dreams of "fine things" that drive the factor along. Of course, the marriage is only a half-success. Unfortunately, by brute force the book achieves a suddenly happy ending, with the marriage of George, at Josephine's death, to his first love of years ago. K. F.

Cora, by Ruth Suckow. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

IT IS TRUE, as the publisher remarks, that in this novel is a warmth which has been lacking in Miss Suckow's previous writing. This warmth is sufficient to make Cora live vigorously and vividly for us in the earlier chapters; it is not sufficient to make her an entirely satisfying character throughout the book. For Cora deserts her business career and all her former ideals to marry an automobile salesman, who from the first does not exist for the reader. We can feel small sympathy for her in this situation, nor does the author, apparently, feel much more—the portion of the book which tells of Cora's return to her mother's house after her desertion is quite devoid of feeling. Somehow this does not seem the proper theme or the proper time for Miss Suckow to play the scientist. But the first part of the book, and indeed all of it that deals with the Schwietert family, is full of warmth, and the characters are lifelike. Cora's father and mother are particularly fortunate creations. C. S.

Contributors

JOHN DEWEY, the distinguished educator and philosopher, needs no introduction to readers of The New Republic. His latest book is "The Quest for Certainty."

PARKER THOMAS MOON is an associate professor of International Relations at Columbia University, and the author of "A Syllabus of Imperialism and World Politics," "International Relations," and other books.

A. E. COPPARD, the English poet and short-story writer, is the author of "Fishmonger's Fiddle," "Silver Circus," and other books. A volume of his poems is to be published this spring.

RALPH L. WOODS wrote an article similar to "The Land of the Free: 1929" for The New Republic a year ago.

FRANCES M. FROST is a young Vermont poet. Her first book of verse, "Hemlock Wall," was published this fall.

PADRAIC COLUM, the Irish poet and prose-writer, is the author of "Wild Earth," "Dramatic Legends," and other books.

R. P. BLACKMUR, poet and critic, was, until recently an editor of The Hound and Horn.

R. M. MACIVER is the author of "Community" and "The Modern State."

ROBERT C. BINKLEY is an associate professor of History at Smith College.

GEOFFREY T. HELLMAN is on the editorial staff of The New Yorker and is one of the editors of The Miscellany, a new literary magazine.

The
Amalgamated Bank
of New York

NOW PAYS

4¾%

Interest

Following its original policy to share its profits with all depositors, The Amalgamated Bank increased its interest rate to 4¾ per cent. January 1st.

Just as it was the first commercial bank in New York to increase the interest rate to 4½%, The Amalgamated is now the first to put the rate up to 4¾% and the sum necessary to pay this increased rate has been laid aside from the profits of 1929.

Nor is this all. The Amalgamated renders and has long been rendering services which haven't hitherto been considered part of the service to be expected from a banking institution. Why it can do so is simply because it was not founded for the purpose of making large dividends for its stockholders.

The Amalgamated is the *Bank with a Social Vision* and what it has already done in this field is but a small measure of its possible achievements, if it can substantially increase its deposits.

That is why we now make this special call to all progressive men and women to become depositors of our bank.

Our location at 11-15 Union Square, West, is readily accessible to every one. Banking hours on Mondays are 9:30 to 7; Saturdays, 9:30 to 5; other days 9:30 to 6.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE

Program—Jan. 17-25

AT COOPER UNION

8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock.

Admission Free

Friday, Jan. 17—Dr. Everett Dean Martin:

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PROGRESS
"What Can and Cannot Be Controlled by Social Engineering?"

ETHICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
Suday, Jan. 19—Dr. Joseph Jastrow: "The Impediments of Thought."

NATURAL SCIENCE
Tuesday, Jan. 21—Mr. William R. Curry: "The Concept of Electricity."

MUHLENBERG BRANCH LIBRARY

209 West 23rd Street, at 8:30 o'clock.

Monday, Jan. 20—Dr. Mark Van Doren: "The Autobiography of America—The Silver Age."

Wednesday, Jan. 22—Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell: "The Industrial Discipline—Government and Industry."

Thursday, Jan. 23—Dr. E. G. Spaulding: "The Development of Fundamental Ideas and Fundamental Problems in Philosophy and Science.—Are Quantity and Quality the Same?"

Saturday, Jan. 25—Dr. Houston Peterson: "Types of Character—Anatomy, Endocrinology and Personality."

EDUCATIONAL

Philips Tutoring School

A new idea in education. Your boy may be failing, not because he is dull, but because his teachers have not found him. Try our plan of personal tutoring under experienced tutors. It gives the boy a chance. We supervise his work and teach him how to study. One vacancy February 1. References required.

JESSE EVANS PHILIPS, A.M.
West Chester, Pa.

Ideal nursery for Children between 18 months and 8 years. Roof garden. Sunny spacious playroom facing Central Park. Scientific care and psychological direction. Cornelia Goldsmith, formerly Walden School Nursery Director-in-Charge. Telephone: Schuyler 5202. Address: 2 West 88th Street.

LANGUAGES

UNIVERSAL INSTITUTE OF
LANGUAGES ITALIAN—GERMAN FRENCH—SPANISH

Private lessons 75c (Daily 9-9). Native teachers. Simplified conversational method. 18 years' experience. Also neglected English education. 1265 Lexington Avenue, Northeast corner 85th Street.

FRENCH, SPANISH, ITALIAN, GERMAN, ENGLISH

Conversational method, Carefully selected Native teachers. Private lessons, 75c, short course, 9 to 9 daily, 18th year.

FISHER'S SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
1264 Lexington Avenue, N. W. Cor. 85th St.

DISCUSSION

THE GROUP

A Clearing House of Opinion
meets at
Auditorium—150 West 85th Street
Tuesday, January 21st, at 8:30 P. M.
DR. E. BOYD BARRETT
(Ex Jesuit Priest and Psycho-Analyst)
will speak on
"SIN AND SAINTLINESS"

Sunday afternoon, at 4 P.M. (Jan. 26th)
Informal Discussion Group
Seymour A. Seligson
will speak on
EUGENE O'NEILL
(Hamlet Facing The Dynamo)
Admission 50c. Organized 1918

THE INTERNATIONAL CLUB

2 West 64th St., New York.

Sunday, Jan. 19th, 4:00 P.M. AN HOUR OF MUSIC. Excellent program of vocal and instrumental music.
TEA. Admission to non-members, 50c.

Sunday, Jan. 26th, 4:00 P.M. Lecture by NATHANIEL PEFFER, on "CHINA AND THE WESTERN POWERS." ("China's Fight for Equality.")
TEA. Admission to non-members, 50c.

PLEASE WRITE FOR OUR COMPLETE PROGRAM.

TRAVEL

TRAVEL JOYOUSLY, HAPPILY

Two beautiful, 7-passenger limousines and ten people to use them. In leisurely, carefree fashion we travel through Europe, in our own private cars, seeing old-world sights as they should be seen—gayly, joyously—never glumly, depressed by hard travel, exhausted by wearisome sight-seeing. Our group is not yet complete; there is still room—perhaps for some one who has no one with whom to travel, or who wants to get away from his or her friends and family for a breathing space and hates the idea of a "tour." A young daughter would be welcome; an elderly but active mother whose children might combine to send her; a man and wife who would like to travel together without any worries or cares. I used the cars for such a trip last summer so I know what a joy it can be for all of us. Two and a half delightful months away from everyone you ever heard of. References exchanged. E. D. K., 277 W. 12th St., New York City.

EUROPE

33 DAYS $295

Foremost Student Tours
Nearly 4000 satisfied members in 1929
250 All Expense Tours
Small groups, 1st class hotels, more motor travel. Visit the Passion Play of 1930. *Send for booklet.*
COLLEGE TRAVEL CLUB
154 Boylston St. Boston, Mass.

VOCATIONAL SERVICE

Gertrude Stein, Inc. 18 East 41st St.
Vocational Service Agency Lexington 2593
A professional and commercial employment bureau for women. We specialize in secretarial, social service, research, publicity and home economics positions.

POSITION WANTED

ECONOMIST-STATISTICIAN, with executive and editorial experience in large organization, in full charge of research program, desires a change of position allowing for more vivid experience; a young woman with Master's degree from Columbia, wide cultural knowledge and interest in real ideas. E. L., 142 West 11th St., New York.

TUTORING

Graduate of University of Wisconsin desires position as private tutor; anywhere; either sex from 12 up; Informal experience. Literature and painting; Latin, French, Spanish; anything except science and mathematics. Edward L. Klein, 3141 Durrell Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.

BOOKS

THE BOOKS YOU CAN'T GET ELSEWHERE

may be rented for a nominal fee. Members throughout the United States have access to a large collection of rare, scarce, out-of-print, strange and curious books; limited, privately-printed editions, unabridged translations and extraordinary new books. Please state occupation or profession when writing for information and lists.

Esoterika Biblion Society
45 West 45th Street, Dep't C-2 New York City

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!

We hold 2,000,000 of the best books—new, second-hand, out-of-print, rare—all subjects. Also Sets of Authors. Catalogue free (25 issued). Outline requirements and interests. Books sent on approval. FOYLES, Charing Cross Rd., London, England.

GENERAL

REAL HARRIS TWEED

The aristocrats of all sports wear—direct from makers. Sample free. Suit-lengths by Mail. Carriage Paid. NEWALL, 159 Stornoway, Scotland.

Bookcases made to order by Master Craftsmen. Size 2 feet wide by 4 feet 6 inches high. Shelves 8 inches deep. Provided with back, any finish desired.
Price Five Dollars
Cash or check to accompany order. Hossack Bros. Inc., 93 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EARN $25 WEEKLY

Spare Time, writing for magazines, newspapers. Copyright Book, "How to Write for Pay" FREE.
PRESS INSTITUTE,
501 Ozark, St. Louis, Mo.

PATENTS AND TRADE MARKS

Protect your most valuable assets
LESTER L. SARGENT
Registered Patent Lawyer.
1115-K Street, Washington, D. C.

NOW IS THE TIME

If you want a more than average job, or a more than average person to fill one—

If you want to rent an apartment, or let one to a responsible person—

If you have any unusual want that an unusual audience may be expected to satisfy—

Advertise in

The NEW REPUBLIC

The Lost Individual

the second of the series of five articles

by JOHN DEWEY on

Individualism, Old and New

will appear in an early issue of
The New Republic

IN THIS article Dewey argues from the premise that the development of a civilization outwardly corporate has been accompanied by a submergence of the individual. In a brilliant analysis of the bewilderment which has resulted from the individual's loss of loyalties and assured objects of belief, he takes up, first, the economic confusion, then the political, and last, the religious. He maintains that individuals are blindly groping their way through situations which they do not direct because their beliefs and ideals are not relevant to the society in which they act, and suggests the way in which the harmony can be restored. The article is one of the most provocative that Dewey has written, and is certain to arouse controversy.

Make sure that you do not
miss it by sending in the coupon below

THE NEW REPUBLIC
421 West 21st Street
New York, N. Y.

For the enclosed $1.00 please send me The New Republic for 13 weeks, including all the remaining Dewey articles.

Address.....

Name.....

1-22-30

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., 469 Pearl St., New York, N. Y.

H·G·WELLS OUTLINE OF HISTORY and 85 OTHER FAMOUS BEST SELLERS

NOW ONLY $1 each

Full [illegible] size. Each volume is 5¾ x 8¼ inches. Handsomely bound in cloth.

Which of These 86 Best Sellers Did You Put Off Buying When They Were $2.50 to $5.00 Each?

5. SCIENCE REMAKING THE WORLD —*Otis W. Caldwell and Edwin B. Slosson.* Former price, $2.50
6. AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN Former price, $2.00
7. A BOOK OF OPERAS—*Henry E. Krehbiel.* Former price, $2.50
9. EDGE OF THE JUNGLE—*William Beebe.* Former price, $3.00
11. COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE—*Judge B. B. Lindsey and Wainwright Evans.* Former price, $3.00
12. THE RIGHT TO BE HAPPY—*Mrs. Bertrand Russell.* Former price, $2.00
13. CLEOPATRA—*Claude Farrel.* Former price, $2.50
15. IN BRIGHTEST AFRICA—*Carl E. Akeley.* Former price, $2.50
18. HAUNCH, PAUNCH AND JOWL—*Samuel Crothers.* Former price, $3.00
19. THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY—*H. G. Wells.* This world famous book in one volume. Unabridged. 1,200 pages, with all original illustrations, maps, etc., etc. Former price, $5.00
21. RECOLLECTIONS AND LETTERS OF GENERAL ROBERT E. LEE—*Captain Robert E. Lee.* Former price, $5.00
22. THE LIFE OF PASTEUR—*D. Vallery-Radot.* Former price, $5.00.
23. ASTRONOMY FOR EVERYBODY—*Prof. S. Newcomb.* Former price $2.50
24. MY LIFE AND WORK—*Henry Ford* in collaboration with *Samuel Crowther.* Former price, $3.50
27. LINCOLN'S OWN STORIES—*Anthony Gross.* Former price, $2.00
28. BY CAMEL AND CAR TO THE PEACOCK THRONE — *H. Alexander Powell.* Former price, $3.00
29. A SECOND BOOK OF OPERAS—*Henry H. Krehbiel.* Former price, $2.25
30. CIRCUS PARADE—Jim Tully. Former price, $2.50
31. FOUR MONTHS AFOOT IN SPAIN —*Harry A. Franck.* Former price, $2.00
33. FARRY LANDS OF THE SOUTH SEAS—*Holland Nordhoff.* Former price, $4.00
34. SHANDYGAFF — *Christopher Morley.* Former price, $2.00
35. THE NEW BOOK OF ETIQUETTE —*Lillian Eichler.* Former price, $4.00
36. BIRD NEIGHBORS— *Neltje Blanchan.* Former price, $5.00
37. THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENEVENUTO CELLINI—*Translated by J. Addington Symonds.* Former price, $3.00
38. NOW IT CAN BE TOLD—*Philo Gibbs.* Former price $2.00
39. THE LOG OF THE SUN—*William Beebe.* Former price, $4.00
40. "DAWGS"—*Charles Wright Gray.* Former price $3.50
42. ADVENTURES OF AN AFRICAN SLAVER—*Capt. Theodore Canot.* Former price, $4.00
43. THE SECOND EMPIRE—*Philip Guedalla.* Former price, $5.00
45. CATHERINE THE GREAT—*Katherine Anthony.* Former price, $4.00
47. TRAMPING ON LIFE—*Harry Kemp.* Former price, $3.00
50. SIX YEARS IN THE MALAY JUNGLE—*Carveth Wells.* Former price, $3.00
52. THE SAGA OF BILLY THE KID— —*Walter Noble Burns.* Former price, $2.50
53. FAMOUS TRIALS OF HISTORY— —*Lord Birkenhead.* Former price, $4.00
55. THE CONQUEST OF FEAR—*Basil King.* Former price, $2.00
56. TRAINING FOR POWER AND LEADERSHIP—*Grenville Kleiser.* Former price, $3.00
57. THE BOOK OF LETTERS—*Mary O. Crowther.* Former price, $3.00
58. THE NEW DECALOGUE OF SCIENCE—*Albert E. Wiggam.* Former price, $3.00
59. THE BOOK OF WOODCRAFT — *Ernest P. Seton.* Former price, $3.00
60. NATURE'S GARDEN—*Neltje Blanchan.* Former price, $5.00
61. THE MAUVE DECADE — *Thomas Beer.* Former price, $3.50
63. PAUL BUNYAN—*James Stephens.* Former price, $2.50
64. JUNGLE DAYS—*William Beebe.* Former price $3.00
67. A STORY TELLER'S STORY — *Sherwood Anderson.* Former price, $3.00
70. THE FABULOUS FORTIES—*Meade Minnigerode.* Former price $3.50
71. BEGGARS OF LIFE—*Jim Tully.* Former price $3.00
72. A LAUGH A DAY KEEPS THE DOCTOR AWAY—*Irvin Cobb.* Former price $2.50

Among the $2.50 to $5.00 best-sellers now in the Star Dollar list are: WELL'S OUTLINE OF HISTORY; WHY WE MISBEHAVE; RASPUTIN: THE HOLY DEVIL; THE GREAT HORNSPOON; TRADER HORN; COUNT LUCKNER: THE SEA DEVIL; COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE, by Judge Lindsey; THE RED KNIGHT OF GERMANY; ADVENTURES OF AN AFRICAN SLAVER—all offered at $1.00. See them at your bookseller's—or send for your choice on 5 days' free examination plan.

73. SUPERS AND SUPERMEN — *Philip Guedalla.* Former price $2.50
75. MURDER FOR PROFIT — *William Bolitho.* Former price $2.50
76. A PARODY OUTLINE OF HISTORY *Donald Ogden Stewart.* Former price, $2.00
77. THE NEW AGE OF FAITH—*Langdon-Davies.* Former price, $2.50
79. EDISON: THE MAN AND HIS WORK—*G. S. Byron.* Former price, $4.00
81. THE MEANING OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION—*Everett Dean Martin.* Former price, $3.00
82. EMINENT VICTORIANS — *Lytton Strachey.* Former price, $3.50
83. REVOLT IN THE DESERT—*T. E. Lawrence.* Former price, $5.00
85. THE STORY OF MY LIFE—*Sir Harry H. Johnston.* Former price, $5.00
86. PSYCHOANALYSIS AND LOVE— *Andre Tridon.* Former price, $3.50
87. STUDIES IN MURDER—*Edmund L. Pearson.* Former price, $3.00
88. WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS: HIS LIFE AND WORK—*Marie D Gorgas and Burton J. Hendrick.* Former price, $5.00
89. HOW TO LIVE—*Arnold Bennett.* Former price, $5.00
90. ABRAHAM LINCOLN—*Lord Charnwood.* Former price, $3.00
91. FATHERS OF THE REVOLUTION —*Philip Guedalla.* Former price, $3.50
92. DISRAELI AND GLADSTONE—*D. C. Somervell.* Former price, $3.50
93. CREATIVE CHEMISTRY—*Edwin E. Slosson.* Former price, $3.00
94. HEAD HUNTERS OF THE AMAZON —*F. W. Updegraff.* Former price, $3.00
95. GENTLEMAN JOHNNY BURGOYNE —*F. J. Huddleston.* Former price, $3.00
96. TRADER HORN—*Alexine P. Hunt and Bithedreda Lewis.* Former price, $3.00
97. THE FRUIT OF THE FAMILY TREE—*Albert Edward Wiggam.* Former price, $3.00
98. WHITE SHADOWS IN THE SOUTH SEAS—*Frederick O'Brien.* Former price $3.00
99. THE DOCTOR LOOKS AT LOVE AND LIFE—*Joseph Collins, M.D.* Former price $3.00
100. BOB, SON OF BATTLE—*Alfred Ollivant.* Former price, $2.00
101. "HOSSES"—Compiled by *Charles Wright Gray.* Former price $3.00
102. PERFECT BEHAVIOR — *Donald Ogden Stewart.* Former price, $3.00
103 ADVENTURES IN CONTENTMENT—*David Grayson.* Former price, $2.00
104. COUNT LUCKNER, THE SEA DEVIL—*Lowell Thomas.* Former price, $3.00
105. THE RED KNIGHT OF GERMANY——*Floyd Gibbons.* Former price, $3.00
106. WHY WE MISBEHAVE — *Samuel Schmalhausen.* Former price, $3.00
107. THE REVOLT OF MODERN YOUTH——*Judge Ben B. Lindsey and Wainwright Evans.* Former price, $3.00
108. RASPUTIN: THE HOLY DEVIL— Former price, $3.00 *Rene Fulop-Miller.*
109. THE GREAT AMERICAN BAND-WAGON—*Charles Merz.* Former price, $3.00
110. SCOUTING ON TWO CONTINENTS —*Major Frederick R. Burnham.* Former price, $3.00
111. THE SON OF MAN: THE STORY OF JESUS—*Emil Ludwig.* Former price, $3.00
112. THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN EX-COLOURED MAN—*James Weldon Johnson.* Former price, $3.00
113. SHANTY IRISH—*Jim Tully.* Former price, $3.00
114. AN INDIAN JOURNEY—*Waldemar Bonsels.* Former price, $4.00
115. THE GREAT HORN SPOON— Former price, $3.00

SEND NO MONEY 5 DAY FREE EXAMINATION

STAR BOOKS

PAY NOTHING IN ADVANCE NOTHING TO POSTMAN

IT is hard to believe such book value possible at only $1. That is why we are making this FREE EXAMINATION OFFER. Use the coupon to mark the titles you want and mail it without money. Read the books for 5 days. Then send us only $1, plus 10 cents postage, for each title you keep. If you do not admit this the biggest book value you ever saw, return the volumes and forget the matter. The editions of many titles are limited—don't delay. GARDEN CITY PUBLISHING CO., Dept. 231, Garden City, New York.

GARDEN CITY PUBLISHING CO., Dept. 231, Garden City, New York

Please send me the **STAR DOLLAR BOOKS** encircled below. I will either send you in 5 days, $1 plus 10 cents postage for each volume, or will return the books without being obligated in any way.

(Encircle Numbers of Books You Want)

5	6	7	9	11	13	15	18	19	21	23	24	27	29	30	31	33
34	35	36	37	38	39	40	42	43	45	46	47	50	52	53	55	56
57	58	59	60	61	63	64	67	70	71	72	73	75	76	77	79	81
82	83	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99
100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	

Name .....

Please print plainly.

Address ..... City .....

CANADIAN ORDERS $1.10 per book, cash with order.